SIGILLVM · VNIVERSITATIS · CALIFORNIENSIS
FIAT LVX
MDCCCLXVIII
EX LIBRIS

CHILDREN BY CHANCE OR BY CHOICE

AND SOME CORRELATED CONSIDERATIONS

BY

WILLIAM HAWLEY SMITH

Author of "All the Children of All the People,"
"The Evolution of Dodd," etc.

BOSTON
RICHARD G. BADGER
THE GORHAM PRESS

COPYRIGHT, 1920, BY RICHARD G. BADGER

All Rights Reserved

HQ 766
S6

Made in the United States of America

The Gorham Press, Boston, U. S. A.

TO ALL HONEST AND THOUGHTFUL MEN AND WOMEN
EVERYWHERE WHO WOULD "SEEK FOR TRUTH
AS FOR HID TREASURE"

THIS BOOK IS DEDICATED

IN A SPIRIT OF LOVE AND SERVICE

453148

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/childrenbychance00smitrich

"The present is a scientific age, and in the domain of science, contentment with attained conditions is a curse. It paralyzes initiative, thwarts achievement, and fosters the 'pride of ignorance.' Conten'ment is the force that restrains the timorous from abandoning that which has been condemned by logic and repudiated by experience. It is the amber in which defects are handed down from one generation to another. Contentment keeps us within the compass of present possession, commits us to the fewest means of being satisfied, and blinds us to the fact that all things are susceptible of betterment."

TO THE READER

As you begin the reading of this book, I have a request, or at least, a suggestion to make, namely, that you will begin at the beginning and read what follows "in course," and not "skipping 'round"! !

My reason for asking this is, that it is only by pursuing the first-noted method that you can get out of the book what I have tried to put into it; or, really can obtain any comprehensive grasp of what the book really contains! And it is for what the book really contains that I have written it; and it is with the same purpose that you should read it.

The need for this word of caution is, that the title of the book suggests so sharply what the reader is anxious to learn about, that he or she will want to come *at once* to details, and so will go rambling about through the pages in search of the much-desired information. Whoever does this is not only doomed to disappointment, but will entirely miss the main motive and principle which the book contains. And such an outcome is something to be avoided, if possible, as it will render both my writing and your reading of none effect. So don't do it that way!

My discussion of the subject which I have treated in this book is in the nature of a mathematical demonstration, or logical proof of the proposition suggested by the title, "Children by Chance or by Choice," etc.; and one can never master either of these methods of solving a problem, or of arriving at a satisfactory conclusion, without following, step by step, *all* the items involved in the argument! And if the reader merely "dips into" the pages here and there, he can never find out either what they were written to substantiate or what he is anxious to know!

So read "in course," please, and then I think there is at least a possibility that we may all get something out of these pages which will be really worth while.

WM. HAWLEY SMITH

Peoria, Illinois
September 4, 1919

FOREWORD

It is utterly useless to attempt to blink the fact that as times change and the world progresses, conditions change and new policies are imperative. I doubt if the enlightened makers of our Constitution expected or intended that it could be a perfect document, suited to cover all possible contingencies for all future time. At any rate, they left an avenue for amendment open, and we avail ourselves of it from time to time.

But in the earlier day of the world, when the inspired writer imputed Onan's race-suicidal attempts to him for criminality and made his sudden death appear as a punishment from the Lord for his crime, it is doubtful if the sacred writer's inspiration took cognizance of present-day conditions.

It is hardly safe to assert that the same divine Over-ruler who said, "Be fruitful and multiply," when the world was young and population sparse, would use identical phraseology now when applied to sections crowded with the physically and mentally deficient, with struggling, suffering women and underfed, joyless men.

We have come to believe that God means to be good to His creatures and that most of their sufferings and shortcomings depend on their shortsighted ignorance of His law or their imperfect interpretation of it, not on the inexorable demands of a jealous Creator.

If war, pestilence, and famine cease, and altruism prevails, we do not need to refer to Malthus for information as to conditions which inevitably result. We surely know that with unrestricted production of offspring there would be a struggle, for a time, for the fit to find means to provide for the unfit; but that, in the end, without intelligent restrictive measures, the two together would populate the earth beyond the possibility of sustenance for either. We have already seen this in China. We have seen it in India. We have seen it in the slums of great cities. On the other hand, we have the unique experiments of New Zealand and Holland, where, as fewer are born more are reared. We also have our own anomaly of wealthy and educated families (families in name only) with one child or none, and opposed to this the ignorant toiler and his wife, struggling with their handicap of ignorance and their burden of half a score or more of children. This may be a family, but it is hardly marriage. The former condition (except where physical disabilities prevent child-bearing) might better be called prostitution than marriage; the latter might better be called slavery.

Control there has been, is, and will be. What shall it be, legal or illegal, sane or insane, humane or barbarous?

The writer of these introductory lines has, for a quarter of a century, spent all the time and thought that he could spare from the family breadwinning (since he has six children of his own) in devising ways and means of encouraging or compelling the childless to have families, the over-burdened to curtail, the unmarried to marry, and the married to live naturally, healthfully, and happily.

Never has he seen a book which so simply and sensibly puts before the American public the unanswerable arguments for proper regulation in the size of families.

We need clear expositions on this subject today, when iniquitous laws, conceived, to be sure, in good faith by self-appointed guardians of the public conscience, cause all good people shame and the ignorant or credulous disease, misery and death; when long instructed tradition, born of ignorance, is so strong that sane efforts to change laws which most enlightened nations have already changed, meet with open hostility or surreptitious side-tracking in the halls of Congress; and still the carnage goes on, though the war is over.

Intelligent men and women whose families number from two to five children find it almost impossible to live on incomes ranging from two to four thousand a year, while less intelligent workingmen and women, with families several times as large are, many of them, obliged to live on half that income. Young men and women refrain from marriage because, though income has known limits, they know no way of limiting the size of the family. Others, with definite knowledge, marry and have no family, while others, already married and with half a score of children, continue, in their ignorance, to add yet another child annually.

Ignorance and prejudice and old-time dogma have had their day with this question, and reason and common sense are being applied to it.

The author of this book is no novice, "The Evolution of Dodd" made him famous, and "All the Children of All the People" was a great addition to our pedagogical literature and had been so recognized by the teachers of many states; but he has excelled himself in the present volume, wherein he so humanly, irrefutably, appealingly, shows the truths which some social workers and scientists have grasped, but which the people generally have heeded little as questions of gravest public import, though multitudes of individuals have defied law and scorned tradition in attempting to find rational solutions of these problems for themselves.

This is not such an absolutely unknown field as the author states in his introduction; but it is true that among the people generally little is known. Great is our disgrace and responsibility that we, as a medical profession, know things which we know are for the people's good, and yet do not rise up as one man and demand legal right to teach these truths. Great also is the responsibility of legislatures and people to know that these things are known if they do not immediately enact or demand the enactment of the proper legislation. So, since we already know what to do, since we have adequate remedies for this disease of civilization if we could only apply them, this book must serve a wonderful purpose and be of inestimable value in correcting the erroneous thinking of the "neo-Platonic ascetics" whom we still have, and whose "opinions" are still "intermingled with the dogmas of the early Christian theology," and in awakening people to a sense of their responsibility toward their fellow-creatures, even if their own knowledge, probably surreptitiously obtained, is adequate for their own needs.

I believe that this book in itself is capable of awakening a strong enough public opinion to demand and obtain immediate legislation which would so correct our laws as to annually save thousands of lives and countless unspeakable miseries.

I would therefore characterize its author, who advocates "love and service" in his writings and exemplifies them in his life, as a great apostle of this doctrine. Surely he is an altruist par excellence, since his ideas for racial betterment are so sane that sensible people cannot fail to at once adopt them.

W. F. Robie, M.D.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

INTRODUCTION 19

I CHANCE, CHOICE, AND PROGRESS 27

II SOME BITS OF HISTORY 33

III "GO TO THE ANT" 37

IV THE PLUS OF HUMANITY 44

V FURTHER STUDIES OF THE PLUS OF HUMANITY . . 63

VI THE THREE I'S 74

VII SOMETHING OF WHAT ALL THESE THINGS HAVE TO DO WITH CHILDREN BY CHANCE OR BY CHOICE 85

VIII SOME STUDIES AS TO THE REAL MISSION OF SEX IN THE HUMAN SPECIES 104

IX WHAT OUGHT TO BE DONE UNDER THESE CIRCUMSTANCES? 119

X THE PROS AND CONS OF THE ISSUES INVOLVED IN THE POSITION JUST TAKEN 143

XI SOME REVIEWS AND DEMONSTRATIONS OF THE PLUS OF HUMANITY, AS IT APPLIES TO SEX IN THE HUMAN SPECIES 203

XII SOME RESULTS THAT WOULD PROBABLY FOLLOW SUCH A NEW ORDER OF THINGS IN MARRIED LIFE . . . 242

XIII OBJECTORS AND OBJECTIONS, AND SOME ANSWERS TO BOTH 260

XIV WHEN SHALL THESE THINGS BE? 286

XV SOME REASONS WHY WHAT SHOULD BE WILL BECOME WHAT MUST BE 297

XVI ONE OTHER CORRELATED SUBJECT 344

INTRODUCTION

In undertaking a study of what is set forth on the title page of this book, namely: "Children by Chance or by Choice, and Some Correlated Subjects," I am aware that I am venturing into a region that comes as near to being the absolutely unknown as anything that still remains unexplored, in all the world.

There is not a single phase of all the issues involved in these matters that is as yet settled with scientific certainty.

Whether the substitution of choice for chance, in bringing children into the world, is a possibility, even for certain individual parents, is as yet a mooted question, when it comes to the experiences of married men and women, take them as they go!

Much less is it known whether, even if such were discovered, such a definite possibility could ever be made available for all classes and conditions of the human race.

And, even if such a manner of re-populating the earth should be found out, the question still remains whether such conditions would subserve the highest and best interests of humanity as a whole.

In a word, the possibility, the practicability, the utility, the wisdom, of such a condition of affairs in human life—all these are unsettled issues as things now are. So much is certain.

But it is equally certain that the unknown and the unexplored always present legitimate fields for attempted discovery, and there is always a poignant fascination that lures men on to try to find out what no one as yet is certain of!

Millions of money have been spent, and many human lives have been sacrificed in attempts to discover the North Pole. My belief is that the truths I am seeking to discover, in my present search, are of far more moment to humanity than is being able to locate the exact spot on the earth's surface where the north end of its axis sticks out into cold weather!

It is in this spirit, and imbued with this belief, that I have been studying the subjects I have discussed in this book for more than forty years.

In the prosecution of such work, I have been assisted by scores, not to say hundreds, of good men and women, married and unmarried, who have most generously given me the benefit of their own personal experiences along the lines of my search. The first noted of these, namely, the married, have let me know what they have found out regarding the first part of my inquiry, namely, that of bringing children into time and space by choice rather than by chance.

On the other hand, a large number of unmarried men and women have freely submitted to me their own experiences on "some correlated subjects" which are almost, if not quite, as important as the testimony I have heretofore referred to.

Added to the testimony of these two classes of witnesses, I have that of a large number of doctors, lawyers and clergymen, representatives of three professional classes whose work brings them into close touch with those who know most of these vital affairs of life through their own experiences, and which knowledge these have imparted as patients, clients, or parishioners to their physicians, counselors or pastors, respectively.

To all of these I am under more obligation than I can possibly express, not on my part only, but for the sake of the men and women who, I hope, may profit from what these devoted souls have so faithfully and truthfully transmitted to me, and through me to you who may read these pages.

It goes without saying, that in the very nature of things, the personality of these individuals must remain undisclosed; but none the less, they are all worthy of crowns of honor for what they have so generously donated to this supreme cause in human existence.

What I have done is, to put together these many experiences, and by strictly inductive methods of treatment to try to form some conclusions that shall be of lasting value to those who come after—that is, to generations now living and to those yet unborn.

I have treated some of the things that are involved in these subjects by analogical methods, but in all such cases I have used the utmost care to keep such analogies strictly within the bounds in which they may be made to truthfully apply.

We all know that, as a rule, analogy is one of the most dangerous methods of applied reasoning. I need not stop here to tell why this is so. The world is full of illustrations of this fact, however.

But I am certain none of my readers can find cause for accusing me of any unfairness or injustice in this respect. On the other hand, they will give me credit for calling attention to an untold number of the most grave and flagrant violations of true analogical reasonings, on the part of many writers who have used this method of arriving at conclusions regarding the subjects which I have discussed in these pages.

I wish the reader would make special note of this point, and discern how it works out as this book is read.

In order to give the subjects I have treated a strong foundation to rest upon, I have been obliged to go a good way down, or back, into certain basic principles that pertain to human life and human progress. All such treatment naturally comes in the first part of the book, and for it I bespeak the most careful attention and thoughtful study on the part of the reader. It is only by fully mastering this part of my argument that one can come into a state of mind for passing just judgment upon the conclusions I have finally arrived at, and which will be found in the later chapters of what I have written.

I have discussed the issues I have presented from two viewpoints: first, that of common humanity; second, that of common sense. Truly, these two are virtually one, in any final analysis. That they have not always been so is the pity! It is my purpose to make them agree, herewith, though I have separated them somewhat by putting one before the other in what I have written.

So now let us begin at the beginning and reason together, calmly, honestly, scientifically, generously, and in a truly unbiased manner on these subjects which all must acknowledge are the most important in the whole realm of human life and action, and especially so just at this particular period of human history, as the denouement of my argument will show.

CHILDREN BY CHANCE OR BY CHOICE

CHILDREN BY CHANCE OR BY CHOICE

CHAPTER I

CHANCE, CHOICE, AND PROGRESS

In the pursuance of these studies, I wish, first of all, to take up and consider the relative values of *chance* and *choice,* as their influences for producing results appear among the causes of human progress in general. It is in this way that I shall lead up to and raise the question which I hope to answer before we get through, namely, how these factors relatively apply to the matter of bringing children into this world!

On the first of these points it almost goes without saying, for it is practically self-evident, that the measure of human progress, all along the line—all the way from the primordial conditions of mankind to the highest achievements of the race in the most modern times—is the degree to which man has eliminated *chance* as a factor in his life and conditionings, and established *choice,* to the extent of positive certainty of actual results deliberately planned for, and produced by wilfully controlled causes—in its stead!

This is a fundamental principle which is without exception as far as human progress has so far come, as any student of the records of the growth and development of the race can verify if he will take the time to do so.

Just to emphasize the working out of this principle of choice taking the place of chance in human progress, it is only necessary to point out the fact that with primitive man, chance was the chief factor in his life. His food supply was almost wholly dependent upon it, and shelter and clothing were similarly conditioned. If he went out to hunt, he took his chances of finding game, and he fished by the same rule. If he were a shepherd, he led his flock where pasture chanced to be. The first human habitation was a hole in the rocks which its occupant chanced upon, and the scant clothing he and his wore was of chance origin and adaptation. These are the records of individual man in his earliest estate.

Collectively considered, the same chance factors are so pronounced in the early conditionings of the race that their recital seems superfluous. When a plague broke out among a people or tribe, its members had no protection against its ravages, but each had to take his chances of perishing from its unrestricted attacks. Famine ran riot after a chance unfavorable season, and there was no way of warding off its devastations. The sailor on the high seas took his chances of surviving the storms he was ill prepared to weather, and the farmer knew not when he sowed his seed what the harvest would be.

But as man has progressed in the scale of being, all these conditions have changed, to a greater or less degree, and *the measure of his advance is the total of his emancipation from the chances which so long held him in thrall.*

Probably the highest achievements of this principle are found in the realm of animate life-forms below man. Doubtless the variations in plants and animals have always been caused by intelligently directed energy, but none of this was primarily under the control of man; and hence, so far as humanity was concerned, such changes were matters of chance. But as time has gone on man has entered this field of purposeful direction of the life-force, and his guiding hand is now seen in thousands of definite and predetermined forms of vegetable and animal life into whose present status the element of chance enters not a whit. To such degree is this true that it can safely be asserted that the propagation of plants and the breeding of domestic animals at the hands of human guidance is no longer a matter of chance, but one of almost definite scientific certainty. Here not only have the hopes of discoverers been realized, but the utmost dreams of wild enthusiasts have been surpassed.

It is these achievements which lead us to believe that the elimination of chance as a factor in human affairs will progress with the years till it shall practically disappear altogether! This, in spite of the fact that there are some fields in which it still reigns supreme, even at this late day, and the obstacles which are arrayed against its extermination seem almost insurmountable.

Among these yet-to-be-attained accomplishments still to be hoped for is that of bringing children into this world by choice rather than by chance, even if now one hardly dares ask the question: *Will chance ever be cast out from the highest function of human beings, or must souls forever be incarnated at haphazard?*

The processes of evolution are so slow, in their tireless workings, that their watchers and noters sometimes grow heartsick; but, from what they have already accomplished, we are warranted in prophesying what they will yet effect. And since man has become a factor in helping to forward evolutionary processes, in so many of the ways in which the life-force manifests itself, it is not too much to maintain that, *nature and man working together and in harmony, conditions will some day be established which will make it certain that every soul born into* *this world shall enter by the gate of definite purpose and assurance rather than at the portal of chance.*

It must be possible that, some time, in all the human family, the art of love will be discovered, taught, and acquired, and the science of procreation studied and mastered.

And because these things are so, study and investigation as to the laws that pertain to the generation, the growth and the betterment of all forms of life, from the lowest to the highest, human life included, are strictly in order; and to disseminate a knowledge of such helpful discoveries as may be found, to teach those who come after so that wisdom shall take the place of folly, and "I know" shall supplant "I guess" or "may-be-so" in all the realms of life activity—this is the highest service that any soul can render to the human race. Here lies the labor for the original researcher, the explorer, the philosopher, the thinker, and the workers-for-good, in every line of life.

But here, in especial, lie the purpose and the labor which animate and give pertinence to the studies and observations set forth in the following pages, which are devoted to a consideration of the rightful propagation of the human species, to the bringing of human bodies and souls into time and space, and to the issues that are naturally and inseparably connected therewith.

Whether these things shall forever continue to be as they have for the most part, always been, or whether something better can take their place, this is what all that follows in this book is about.

CHAPTER II

SOME BITS OF HISTORY

For the sake of deepening and solidifying the foundation principle of progress by choice rather than by chance, it will be well to review, somewhat in detail, some of the results that have already been achieved in the affairs of this world by the use of this method.

A very simple illustration is the fact that the most luscious apple that now gratifies the human palate has been evolved from the bitter fruit of the crabtree, which will draw one's mouth to a pucker; and this change, this progress, has been brought about by the deliberate *choice* of man to make something better than the primary form of the apple family.

Or, go further back in the expressions of form and force that appear in this world, and note what the choice of man has effected in these realms. See what chemical exploitations have come to under such guidance! Volumes could not obtain the records of the advancements and improvements which have been made on original appearances and primary conditions on this score.

Or, take the line of mechanical appliances, and contrast what now is with what once was, and see how true it is that all advance in this part of the utilization of energy has come as a result of the choice of man! More volumes could be written in substantiation of this proposition, and but half the truth would then be told.

Or, look at all the variations and developments that have been made in animal life through the exercise of this power of choice, *and which power exists in man alone!* Compare the hog of to-day with the wild boar of yesterday, or the horses of this generation with those that primarily roamed the plains in uncounted herds, and all of crude feature and form!

Not to make too long a story of this, or to weary the reader with multitudes of examples, let any one think of any expression of electrical or chemical energy, or of mechanical power, or of life-force, which has been made subject to the influence of the *choice of man,* and note the changes that have been brought about by such means, and he will see the point I am now driving at.

And when this is done, look at the human race, and think how *little* has been accomplished for its improvement, at the hands of *choice* rather than of *chance,* so far as the reproduction of the species is concerned, and then see!

On this count, so far in the world's history, hardly a single move for progress has as yet been made! The marvel of it!

On all other planes except that of the improvement of the human race, the *choice* of man has got in its work; but here it has not, as yet, been given even a reasonable opportunity to express itself. On the contrary, its exercise in this field is, to this day, forbidden by law; and even so grave and reverend a body of men as a committee of leading physicians in one of the foremost Medical Societies in this country, to whom the matter of giving *choice* rather than *chance* a place in the economy of human reproduction was referred, made a report which read: "We must uphold the laws of nature against man's meddling!"

Everywhere else man has "meddled," if you will, with nature's way of doing things; but here, according to this kind of philosophy, he must forever stand back and let nature have her way, regardless!

In the presence of the Bits of History narrated in this chapter, and of thousands of similars that might be cited, it seems incredible that a body of sane and educated men could be guilty of making a report so utterly at variance with the principles embodied in all human progress. But more of this later.

For the present, let the reader permit this remarkable condition of affairs to get a good grip on his reason, his common sense and his conscience, as a most excellent preparation for looking into the following chapters!

CHAPTER III

"GO TO THE ANT"

As a next step in this study of children coming into this world by *choice* rather than by *chance*, I call the attention of the reader to a most common error which has, so far, been made by nearly all writers and talkers on this subject.

I have shown that choice is an universal factor in human progress, wherever progress has been made, and I have further suggested, by implication, at least, that, by the same token, it *should* become an item in the matter of the reproduction of the human species, as it is not yet.

Next, I emphasize, strongly, the fact that *choice* as to what one shall do or shall not do *is a distinctively human characteristic!* No stone, no tree, no mere animal—no form of life or force, below man, has, in and of itself, a *power of choice* which originates in the individual itself, and which can be exercised solely on the initiative of the individual possessing this quality.

All these lower forms of being, or of state, if they act at all, do so under the control of some power other than anything which *originates from within themselves*. They are all *acted upon* by some power *outside* themselves, and their acts are all determined *for* them, rather than originated *by* them. They do what they *must* and not what they *choose* to do!

This is a distinctive difference between man and all other created forms, animate or inanimate, whatsoever; and it is this difference that I insist on to the utmost, just at this point in my argument.

Now it is because of this distinctive difference between human beings and all other created forms, *this power of choice, of individual initiative, on the part of man, that mankind is thereby set outside of, or apart from and beyond all comparisons with other beings which have not this quality, in all matters where an exercise of will has the possibility of taking the place of a compulsory force acting from without, as the basic cause of the acts which are done by the organisms through which one or the other of these forces acts!*

That is, an individuality that has the power within itself of determining its own actions is not to be *guided*, or *ruled*, or *judged* by the laws and precedents that pertain to individualities whose acts are controlled by something outside of, or some one other than themselves!

This is the first great reason why nearly all analogies that are drawn between man and anything below him, are almost entirely worthless, and, in most cases, absolutely false.

Now, in spite of all these plain and undeniable facts, one of the most common methods of trying to teach and direct human beings in their varied ways of life, is to make comparisons with, and to draw analogies from life-forms below mankind, and to apply these, sometimes almost without discrimination or reservation, to the totality of men, women and children, individually and collectively, in all their thoughts, words and deeds!

Thus, Solomon wrote "Go to the ant, thou sluggard," and Jesus said, "Consider the lilies, how they grow." In much the same way Maeterlinck worked out a system of human government from studying hives of bees, and Mendel evolved a theory of the laws of heredity by breeding pigeons; while other men and women have made similar demonstrations in similar ways.

Now all these sayings and conclusions are perfectly right in their way, the only trouble with them being the length to which they are carried by overzealous souls who analogically apply them to humanity! Thus the Wise man was perfectly justified in advising a lazy person to observe and profit by the industrious ways of the ant; and Jesus gave the best of advice to people who were vain of their dress when he said, "Consider the lilies." Likewise

Maeterlinck did a most wonderful piece of patient observation when he studied the ways of bees as he did; and Mendel is to be commended for his patient and persistent methods of breeding fowls and four-footed beasts.

But the point that should be noted with regard to the conclusions and philosophies that are drawn from a study of any and all forms of life below man, and which are afterward made to apply to humanity as a whole, at the hands of analogy is, that they fall down and fail utterly, because of one fatal lack which they all possess, as follows:

Comparisons that are really of value can be made *only between things that are alike at the points at which the comparisons are made; and to push such comparisons, or analogies, on, to points where the things compared differ essentially—this is to make a grave mistake and to distort methods which might work out valuably if only they were not forced beyond their legitimate fields of application!*

And here is the place where all these comparisons between man and lower forms of life, and the conclusions drawn from them, fall short! All these observations and experiments are made upon forms of life below man; and then *they are made to apply to matters and things in the human economy which are totally different from the life-experiences from which they are drawn!*

Thus, all the acts that are referred to in the quotations from the Bible, and the studies I have cited, are done by instinct, merely, and these *acts* are then compared to the *acts* of men and women, which are done under the control of the will, that is by choice; and right there is where all the evils arise from making such comparisons!

The ant is industrious because it is built that way and it could not do other than as it does, even if it should want to, *and it never wants to—is incapable of wanting to!* The lily grows by no volition of its own, but solely by means over which it has, in and of itself, no control whatever. The lily, *per se,* has no guiding ability in determining its form or its colors! It takes the shape it has, and the color with which it is endowed because it *has* to, and not because it *chooses* to! The element of its *own choice* enters into its expression not a whit!

In the same way the bee builds its cells and gathers and deposits its sweets because it *must* and not because it *wills* to do as it does. It *has* to do, rather than *chooses* to do. It is compelled to do what it does rather than acts of its own volition and its own initiative.

In almost identical fashion, Mendel's pigeons and rabbits and guinea pigs were formed, as to their bodies, or marked as to the coverings of those bodies, as they were, one generation after another, not through any *choice* or exercise of *wills* of their own, but solely as some force *other than themselves* predetermined and directed!

And *above all*, so far as my particular argument is concerned, *how many descendants any of these should have was not within the scope of their determining at all, or in any way, shape or manner*, whatever! All these bred because *instinct compelled them to breed*, and not becaues they *chose*, of their own wills to do so! Think of that a minute!

All of which means that the laws and conditions which pertain to the breeding of mere animals differ vitally and immeasurably from those that hold good in the reproduction of the human species, in this essential particular, namely, that the one is grounded in mere INSTINCT *and the other has in its exercise the possible* POWER OF CHOICE.

The possible power of choice as to the number of its progeny has no place in the breeding of merely vegetable or animal life-forms! But there is at least the possibility of the exercise of the power of choice in human procreation, and this fact precludes the possibility of making any analogical comparison between the two, which shall hold good in the essentials in the premises!

Drive a stake there, and drive it deep, for it is a center to tie to, that must and will hold when the strain of a sane conclusion is drawn on this particular part of my argument.

As to this matter of instinct as the forceful and guiding factor in mere animal breeding, and of what takes its place in the propagation of the human race, of this I shall have more to say later on. Just now, and to lead up to the next chapter, note well that it is this power of choice which man *has*, and which vegetables and mere animals *have not*, *which makes man man—that is, this quality makes man something more than any form of life which exists below him!*

This *something more* than exists below man, I have named "*the plus of humanity*," and it is this that I shall study in detail before we proceed to the more complex considerations which are involved in the elaborations of the discussion of the subjects in hand.

Let this chapter be summed up, then, in the conclusion that man is more than any plant or any mere animal; that he is more than lily, or ant, or bee, or pigeon, or rabbit or guinea pig, and that, *therefore*, none of his acts which come under the control of his *will*—his power of choice—can be rightly measured by any rod or line whose dimensions are laid out on mere material planes; neither can the right or the wrong of his acts be justly judged by standards which are derived from expressions of the life-force which are below man's scale of being!

Keep this point in mind, as you read on, for it is fundamental in the matter of "the plus of humanity."

CHAPTER IV

THE PLUS OF HUMANITY

By "*the plus of humanity*" I mean, as I have already hinted, all those qualities and attainments which have been acquired by man through the exercise of his own power of *choice*, rather than at the hands of *chance!*

The basis of all this *plus* is the *human will;* and it is the possession and the use of this characteristic on the part of mankind, which distinguishes human beings from all other life-forms! It is this "*plus,*" which is thus added to man's natural make-up (to his mere animality, if you please) *which makes man man;* and which, in its totality, shows the lengths to which man has progressed beyond all other created beings!

This fact is such an important point in what we are studying that it needs something more than a simple statement of its significance and truthfulness; and for this reason I shall devote this chapter to its extended consideration, as follows:

Let us first take a very simple illustration of how this principle applies and holds good in so common a case as that of the *physical appetite for food* as it appears in mankind. Regarding this, I shall show what the *power of choice* and the *will of man* have produced *beyond mere animality*, on this particular part of man's make-up and being.

In common with all animals below man, human beings possess a physical appetite for food. They have to eat to live. But, on the other hand, they do not have to live *merely* to eat, as is practically the case with all other forms of animal life! That is, there is a vast difference in the *purposes* and the *results* that come from the exercise of this quality in eating, as it exists in man and in the forms of life below him.

Thus, among all the animals below man, the sole purposes of physical appetite for food, are first, to keep the body of the possessor alive; and second, to keep that body in such condition that it may reproduce after its own kind. With these two demands of mere animal life satisfied, there is nothing more *possible of realization* on the part of such life-forms, through the aid of, or stimulation by food, the desire for which is seated in physical appetite!

This simple statement of a universal fact needs only to be made to have its truthfulness universally acknowledged.

But now observe the out-working of physical appetite for food as it exists in human beings, and as wrought upon by man's *choice* and *will!* Here, while it still maintains the dual utility-function of its existence, namely, bodily sustenance and the keeping of the body in such condition that reproduction is possible—qualities which are common to all forms of animal life, mankind included—yet it has *added modes of expression which no form of life below mankind possesses in the least degree!*

It is this added quality, *which first shows itself in human beings, this something more* than appears in any previous forms of life, that I call "*the plus of humanity,*" and I am here considering it only insofar as it applies to physical appetite for food, as it exists in mankind.

Something of the extent and significance of this particular "plus," in this regard, let us consider together, for a little as follows:

Suppose you, whoever you are, man or woman, should come to our home for dinner some day. Let us see what such an experience would be like.

We would not make any great "spread" for you, but we would add a few extras in your honor, as you would like to have us, and as we would be pleased to do. And here is something of what you would find:

The well-built table would be covered with a well-laundered and immaculate table-cloth, and at each place about the board there would be laid a napkin, two knives and probably three forks, and an equal number of spoons, or furnishings of equal rank, taste and mutual delight. There would also be an ample supply of glass and of china and other furnishings, etc., etc., as in such cases made and provided, with a vase of flowers in the center of the table, of course. So much for the table itself, as we sat down to it.

And then we would have a soup, or, possibly a fruit cocktail ahead of that, which would be followed by a meat course (though we might put in an extra of fish because you were with us) and after the meat course, we would have a salad, followed by a pudding (or, perhaps pie, for wife and I were both born and raised in the "pie belt," and we still cling to some of our pristine likings, in spite of all the conventions which culture has brought us through the years) and then would come coffee and finger bowls.

There! I hope you would get a fairly satisfactory dinner out of such a menu, for I assure you that everything served on our table would be the best of its kind. To have all our food appear in its best estate on our table, has been a fundamental principle with wife and myself, during the nearly half-century of our married life; and such fact has had much to do with the success of our conjugal relations during all these years. (Please note that last statement well; for, really, it has ever so much significance in the argument which I hope to clinch before I get through.)

And after dinner, we might smoke for an hour in the library, if you are a man; or, if you are a woman, you might take up your crochet work or your tatting, as we sat in easy chairs before a comfortable wood fire on the hearth.

Well, as we sit there and smoke, or "tat," as the case may be, let's review the experiences of the time we have just had together, and see how many of them belong to the *mere animality* there is in us, and how many to the *plus of our humanity!*

How large a factor in that dinner was the purpose merely to keep our bodies alive and in such condition that we could reproduce after our kind? Even to suggest such a question brings a frown to the brow and a qualm to the heart, so small a portion of this part of our lives had even recognition in what took place at this, our mutual meeting.

And yet, to keep alive and to be able to breed is all that any mere animal could have gotten out of such a meal as we have partaken of, or any other!

Go into details a little more, just here, and see what comes from so doing. See how small a part of mere animality there was in the entire occasion! Just eliminate from that dinner everything except what was absolutely necessary to keep life in our bodies and maintain our procreative abilities, and see how little would be left!

Under such ordering, the table goes, the linen goes, all the silver, the glass, the china, the flowers—in a word, all the table furnishings whatsoever. Even the chairs we sat on have no place in such a clearing out of the non-essentials of mere physical existence!

And with the throwing out of these go all the cooking of the various foods; indeed, all the variety of foods themselves, as well; and all that we have left is a heap of raw meat and unground grain, that we can gather about and devour, after the manner of all the rest of animal life except human beings!

To be sure, such bestial manner of feeding together would have sustained life and kept us in condition to cause more of our likes to be—to live as we had lived, and to die as we should have to die; all just as those before us had lived and died, but all without making a single step of progress toward better things in the scale of our being.

(Take a fresh cigar from the holder on the mantle, or begin the next pattern of your thread-work, and let us go on a little further with this talk. Thanks!)

And now see what the *power of choice*, exercised through the *will of man*, had to do with what we experienced at dinner. Looked at in the order of their progress from crude materials to the well-prepared foods we ate, and all the settings and accompaniments that went with these same—such developments and adaptations came as follows:

To begin with, all these improvements on original conditions had their start in the *desire* of man for something better than he already had; and this *desire* was grounded in man's *power to choose.* Without such power, *desire* for better things would not have a leg to stand on! Mere animals have no *power to choose,* on their own initiative, and so *they never start anything, out of themselves,* which will inure to their own improvement, or that of their environment! Such life-forms have no *desire to improve* their condition or their conditionings. They are content to live as they are, and that's enough.

But man, even primitive man, *desired* something better for himself and his, and right there was the beginning of such human progress as resulted in our dinner—and of much else as well, as we shall see later.

The next step in such advance, which resulted in our dinner program, came when the *imagination* of man took up what his *desire* had suggested, and elaborated these as only this faculty of the human make-up is capable of doing. It thought out possibilities; it saw visions and dreamed dreams of what the future might have in store to satisfy the *desires of men,* as these were more or less imperfectly and crudely expressed.

And after the *imagination* had got in its work on the problem which *desire* had suggested, then man's *ingenuity* took up the task of making available, of concretely realizing what was put up to it at the hands of these strictly human qualities, whose activities had preceded its possible expression.

Desire, imagination, ingenuity, all based in man's *power of choice,* and all exercised in the order above stated, each acting in turn upon everything we had to do with at dinner—these are what made possible the meal we have just partaken of.

And it is these same human characteristics, acting in this same order, which are behind and underneath all human progress! It is in the exercise of these strictly human qualities that a *plus of humanity* becomes possible, that it is what it is; and that, being what it is, *puts man in a class by himself, one not to be measured or judged by standards which apply only to that which is below him.* NOTE THAT WELL!

Let me say it again, for it is fundamental, and needs to be inculcated ("inculcated" means kicked in) that it is this *plus of humanity,* which has come to mankind at the hands of *desire, imagination and human ingenuity,* all based on man's *power of choice,* which makes man man! Were it not for these possessions, exercised on man's own initiative, he would be no more than any other created life-form, just a plant in the ground or a beast of the field, merely that and nothing more!

(Let's think of that a minute while we make rings of smoke, or ravel out a mistake in the last pattern. Now we will go on.)

Really, what we actually *ate* as we sat at table, was the smallest part of our dining together! I doubt if, a week from now you could tell what it was you had eaten as our guest. But the plusses of that meal! The converse we had as we ate! The stories we told, the views of life we discussed, the grace of wife as she poured the coffee or handed you an extra lump of sugar for your cup—all these things, and a score besides, none of which had the least thing in the world to do with the mere animality of your being or mine, and not one of which any animal other than man could, by any possibility, get anything out of—all these things, all these "plusses," you will not only remember, but all such are now a part of your life, and you are, and always will be, a stronger and a better man or woman, on all sides of your human existence, as a result of our breaking bread together as we did.

(And we will think of that a minute, as we smoke or knit; for, involved in all this, and wrapped up in it somewhere and somehow, is this *plus of humanity*, as it pertains to the physical appetite of man, which I am trying to reveal and to show the meaning of.)

And excuse me if, once more, for the sake of driving this point home, I insist on the fact that if it had not been for *the ingenuity of men*, inspired by their *desires* and *imaginations*, which manipulated for our uses the crude elements which, in a raw form, sustain life in mere animals, but which appeared on our table as they did—if it had not been for these causative factors in the case, there could have been no real human progress for us, nor for any in the world, so far as growth through the physical appetite is concerned; but we, and with us all mankind, would have forever remained like the rest of the brutes, and never have risen above the plane of animality in any way! That is, *if* man had been compelled always to eat unground grain and raw meat, he could never have become the mental, moral and spiritual being he now is, even in the lowest forms of the expression of these god-like qualities!

What I bear down on hard again, is, that it was the *ability to choose*, which man alone has, acting by means of his *inventive powers*, which were, in turn, inspired by his *desires* and led on by his *imagination*, that makes progress for himself possible, that brought a *plus* to the race! And this same power has kept adding to that increment of humanity as time has gone on through all the years that man has lived in this world.

And what has been shall be, in all the realms of human life, so long as man is man!

(Blow another ring of smoke, or pause in your knitting, as you think that proposition through!)

Oh, yes, as you say, not all dinners are like ours, but that doesn't alter the main points in my argument. I have eaten many very simple dinners in many very humble homes where the *principle* I am standing for was realized to a supreme degree. You have done the same.

The *plus of humanity*, in the matter of physical appetite, is not confined to any particular class of people; but the principle it contains is as wide-extended as the race itself. And again I say that it is this quality that makes man man!

Of course, it is true that there are yet gluttons in the world. Indeed, I sometimes wonder if it is not true that the majority of mankind are still best pleased with what they can eat! I guess it is true that, if all the people in all the world were gathered together in one place, and one wanted to find some *one* thing which the greatest number of them all were best pleased with, all one should have to do would be to lift up a mighty voice and say: "Oh, all ye people who are best pleased with what you can eat, step out to the left!"

And what a mighty rushing to the left there would be!

But, grant all this as true, that these things are still far from what we wish they were, and that the great majority of mankind would step out to the left on a request such as that suggested; still, thank God! the whole human race would not move in that direction if confronted with such a challenge! There would still be a great multitude who would stand where they were under such interrogation!

And to those who were left so standing, suppose we should again lift up a mighty voice, and say: "Oh, all ye people who are best pleased with what you can *see*, step out!" And again there would be a mighty rushing from the ranks of those who remained after the first call for a division. We all like to "see things." Even a dog-fight is never without interested witnesses! And so, many would leave the ranks who best liked *to see!*

But not all would go!

And if, to those who still remained, we should lift up a mighty voice again, and say: "Oh, all ye people who are best pleased with what you can *hear*, step out!" There would be a great leaving of more who had, so far, declined all invitations to move.

But not all would go!

There would still be left a goodly company, and these would be those who are *best pleased with what they can think!*

Such an experience as I have just depicted would be a self-determined division of humanity which would be the equal of "Judgment Day," in advance, and there is no denying its forcefulness!

But let us never forget that, though all this may be true, the fact remains that the progress of humanity is always increasing the number of those at the small end of this wedge of human beings—that it is forever augmenting the ranks of the *thinkers* from those of the *hearers;* and those of the *hear-*

ers from those of the *seers;* and those of the *seers* from those of the *eaters!*

It is these facts that make life worth living. Let us not forget this when we are inclined to get blue about the status of our fellow men!

One point more, and we will be done with the *plus of humanity* as it pertains to the physical appetite for food, which exists in mankind.

Because there are gluttons in the world, because there are men and women who will gorge themselves to the extent of grossest greediness if they can get choice foods to do the same withal; nay, more, because the great majority of mankind are still best pleased with what they can eat, forsooth—for these reasons, shall we say that the best, or, indeed, the only way to remedy such condition is to try to exterminate physical appetite in men and women, or to reduce it to its lowest terms of mere animality, to merely that of keeping bodies alive and in condition to breed?

Because some men and women abuse the *plus* that has been added to humanity in the matter of eating and drinking, shall we therefore strive to abolish this increment altogether? Because some of the results that have come from the gratification of human *desires* for better food, as the *imagination* of man and his *ingenuity* have acted in response to such ambitions, and so have modified crude fruits and grains and raw meats to suit the educated tastes of mankind—because some of the results are not the best that could be desired, shall we, for these reasons, attempt to root out all such *desires* in mankind, ban all exercise of the *imagination* along these lines, and legally forbid man's *ingenuity* to devise or prepare any meats and drinks other than such as brutes partake of?

Must cook-books be suppressed by law, and must those who make them or sell them be put in prison, because there are men and women who will eat till they die of apoplexy if the viands which these books give recipes for are placed within their reach?

But let us not anticipate! We shall see more of this phase of the subject later on, and at much closer range, and then it will mean much more than it does here and now. Meantime, while we wait, this is as good a place as any to consider a wholesale principle of life which has been claimed by many to apply, not only to man's physical appetite for food, but to other functions of the human body, as follows:

Frankly and impartially stated, the very heart of this principle is seated in a view of the human body which held that it is by nature vile and altogether contemptible in all its parts and passions. According to this mode of reckoning, it was believed that our bodies were "conceived in sin and born in iniquity," and the theory was that, as they began, so they continued to grow till death put an end to their naturally perverted and altogether wicked existence!

Under such conditions, the believer in this doctrine held that the chief purpose in life, if one desired to become what one ought to be, was to "mortify the flesh" and to inhibit all the *natural* desires of the body, because they were, in and of themselves, *sinful*, and tended to drag down, if not ultimately damn human souls, irrevocably.

Such views of the human body have been held by nearly all peoples, and in nearly all times, but they assumed the most pronounced form in the early stages of the development of the Christian religion; and the results of such teachings and practises in this particular religious sect have affected a large percentage of the beliefs and modes of living of the civilized Christian world, even to this day.

There is no need of going into details, for such are not only matters of history which are known and read of all intelligent men and women, but we are, all of us, to a greater or less extent, living witnesses of the influence of such beliefs regarding the human body. This is specially true of all that has to do with what is counted as "good morality" in the civilized world; and if one pushes the point far enough, the principle will be found to be embodied in many of the affairs of life where a superficial glance would not detect its presence.

But in the light of more generous views of, and more scientific knowledge regarding the bodies in which we live, move and have our being, honest interrogation marks are being set up over against the ascetic and Puritanic beliefs of former days, and these challenge the truthfulness of many, not to say most, of what were once regarded as beyond controversy in these matters. More and more, thoughtful men and women are coming to realize that the human body is God-made and sacred within and without, and to hold with the Good Gray Poet, when he says: "Clear and clean is my soul; and clear and clean is my body, and every part of the same; and no part shall be condemned, nor shall any be preferred before the rest."

It is such views of human life and of human bodies and their functionings which make a place for the out-workings of "the plus of humanity" along the lines of the normal development of this part of man's being; and the doctrine that it is a sin to give expression to this *plus*, nay, to cultivate its reasonable fulfillment, is being relegated to the grave-yard of other dead things which have come down to the present from the days of ignorance and superstition.

According to this newly-developed philosophy, it was not a sin for you to sit at meat with us as you did, nor for our table to be what it was, nor for all the *plus* of our natures to find expression as it did during dinner. We were within the bounds of right living to do as we did; and for us all, being what we are, it would have been a sin for us to wipe out all the accessories which we utilized, both for sustaining our bodies with food that pleased our palates and for feeding our higher faculties with mental and spiritual pabulum that the brutes know not of. Made as we are, it would be wicked for us to live on raw meat and unground grain, fed into our mouths with fingers and thumbs! Who that is sane can deny this?

And the most significant factor in all this, so far as any ultimate conclusion is concerned, is the fact that there are *two* modes of expression, in the matter of physical appetite for food as it exists in human beings, while there is only *one* mode of expression for this possession as it exists in mere animals! With the latter, the sole function of this quality is bodily sustenance, merely. In mankind it is all of this; and, beyond that, the building up of the plus of humanity. Furthermore, the exercise of both these functions, as they exist in mankind, is a matter of *choice*, within the control of the *will*, a factor which does not appear, in any perceptible degree, in any order of life below man. This fact makes it impossible to draw any truthful analogies between man and the lower animals, so far as life on these planes is concerned, as I have more than once declared. It may still be feasible to compare some of the minor functionings of the human body with the same, or similar, phenomena in lower orders of life, though even this has its limitations; but in all cases where choice and the human will are in evidence—here all such comparisons are practically impossible, so far as correct conclusions derived therefrom are concerned.

So, here endeth the lesson as it pertains to the *plus of humanity,* which has to do with physical appetite in mankind. I have shown that there has been a progress in this part of man's experiences, from the primitive man up to our table, and yours as well; and that all of such advance has come to me and to you, whoever you are, at the hands of the *power of choice,* as it exists in all mankind, rather than by the ways of *chance,* or of outside dictation (that is, by instinct, merely) which method obtains in all life-forms below man; that all this progress manifests itself in *two* ways in the human family; and that, therefore, analogies between such forms of life and all forms below it are fallacious and of no value whatever.

Desire, imagination, human ingenuity! Keep these three means of human progress in mind as we move on. And never for one moment forget that these are all grounded in *choice* rather than in *chance!*

In all forms of life below man, physical appetite serves only the simple purpose of constructively maintaining the material existence of the beings in which it exists. In mankind, this quality still persists in its original purpose and mode of expression, but it takes on an added quality, which is of an esthetical or spiritual nature, whose end and aim it is to upbuild the plus of humanity and develop the same in all its varied possibilities. That is, physical appetite for food, as it lives in human beings is, first *materially constructive;* and, second, *esthetically* and *spiritually upbuilding* in its results. And this means more than can be comprehended at a single sitting with the thought!

CHAPTER V

FURTHER STUDIES OF THE PLUS OF HUMANITY

Having studied the *plus of humanity* as it is exhibited in physical appetite for food, let us now go on a little further and see how this same principle, the added something, applies to some other qualities which we share with the life-forms below us.

Take the sense of eye-sight and compare its function, as it expresses itself in beasts and men, and note the *plus* that there is in this particular.

If we go back to the most primitive form of an eye, we find that it first shows signs of existence in the protozoa, where it appears in what is known as a "pigment spot," that is, as a tiny part of the body of such life-form, which is sensitive to light. Just what service is thus rendered to the body on which this "spot" appears, no one has as yet been able to determine; but that it is there, and that it is the primary form of what finally becomes a human eye, as it climbs on and up the various stages of its evolution, of this there is not a shadow of doubt.

And now trace, for a little, the function of the eye and what it brings to its possessor, as it rises in the scale of organized life-forms! As I have already said, in the lowest forms of life its mission is so slight that it is indeterminable. But gradually its utility grows, until, in a large part of animal life it serves a number of most valuable purposes. Summed up, its usefulness in most life-forms below man, is to show its possessors where to find food, and to keep them from dangers that may threaten their lives. All mere animals may be said to find their sustenance and to be kept out of harm's way by means of their eyesight.

But when we have said so much we have said all that can possibly be said with regard to the function of eyesight as it pertains to mere animal life! There is absolutely nothing beyond food supply and preservation from physical harm and perhaps death, received at the hands of eyesight, in any life-form below man! Think of that a full minute by the clock before you read on!

But when we come to man, see what a range eyesight has in him! In this realm there is almost no limit to what it may do for its possessor!

To be sure, it is still a means of showing man where and how to get his food, and of keeping him out of harm's way, just as in the life-forms below him; but, oh, how small a part of the mission of eyesight in humanity this is! Think of that a moment! And here are some of the things you will think:

Perhaps, first of all, there is the influence that comes to man from seeing the things in nature that mean more to him than they can possibly mean to any form of life below him. What do you suppose a sunset ever means to a cow or a dog? Yet cows and dogs have eyes—eyes which in some respects are better than human eyes, viewed from a mere mechanical standpoint.

And then think of how much a human being can get out of pictures! Mere animals can get nothing —absolutely nothing—from pictures! But men and women can get ever so much out of pictures! And whatever they get out of pictures is just so much "*plus of humanity*" on the eyesight basis!

And then think of what we get out of reading! Reading is made possible through the use of the eye. All letters, all literature, have come at the bidding of possibilities that were opened up by the fact of the existence of the human eye.

Think of the *plus* that has come to humanity at the hands of *reading*, and then see what this added quality means to mankind! The measure of this increment to human development and possession is absolutely without bounds.

And sailors sail the sea by virtue of eyesight. If Columbus had been born without eyes he would never have discovered America. If Titian had been unable to see, the world would never have known his divine work upon canvas. If eyes could never have read, Homer, and Virgil, and Dante, and Shakespeare, and Milton, and Dickens, and Thackeray, and Whitman, and Emerson, and Thoreau, and Riley, and Mark Twain, and thousands of others could never have been what they were, could never have exercised an influence upon mankind, in any way whatsoever.

If men could not *see*, newspapers and magazines would be impossible; no trains could run; no fabrics could be woven; no wires could be strung; no machinery could be made or operated; no pictures could be painted; no photographs could be taken; no movies could be produced; no stars could be seen, and no inferences could be drawn from their existence in the firmament; no faces could be looked into, and the "love-light in the eye" would never be possible; the mother's look of rapture as she gazes on her child could never be; the untold meanings of the exchange of glances between lovers would be impossible; and even a dim comprehension of "the light that never was on land or sea" would be an utter impossibility without the experiences that have come to man through the exercise of eyesight!

Now, you who read what is here written, put all these things just enumerated together, and as many more as your own sense can supply, and let your imagination raise the sum total to the nth degree, and then you will have at least some comprehension of the "*plus of humanity*" that has come to man through the medium of the human eye! You will then understand that the eye, as men can use it, yields up returns that are far greater and infinitely above anything that any mere animal eyes can ever produce. The mere items of seeing where food is, and of keeping one out of the ditch, have dwindled to nothingness when compared with all these *plusses* that man has acquired because of his ability to see.

Just animals can see; but man can see more than mere material things whose limit of utility is to keep bodies in their proper places! His sight penetrates beyond eyesight, and into the vast beyond; and all that he sees beyond *mere materiality* is what makes up the *plus of humanity*, so far as seeing is concerned.

And note, too, that, just as the physical appetite for food has *two* modes of expression in the human family, namely, the materially-constructive and the esthetically-upbuilding; in a similar manner, eyesight in mankind serves a double purpose, the first of which is physically-preservative merely, and the second esthetically-developing. And this is another item whose full force cannot be defined at a single sitting with the thought.

Once more, let us take up and consider the sense of hearing and note what a plus of humanity there is in the exercise of this faculty which man has in common with the life which is below him.

I need not go into details at any length here. If you will shut your eyes and *listen*, you will know more than I or any could suggest or say! Think of the ocean's roar, the sighing of the night-winds, the songs of birds and hum of bees, the laughter of children, the whisper of love, the prayer of a child, the orator's eloquence, the prima donna's trills, the mother's lullaby, the violin's sweet strains, the diapason of the organ, the voice of great crowds as they sing or cheer together—think of these *sounds* that come to you through your ears, and then remember what they mean, when measured by the standard of the *plus of humanity!*

Nor need one think of sweet sounds only in summing up the total all that comes to man through hearing. Even wails of woe and suffering react on man and make him kindlier, gentler, than before; and battle cries, and maniac yells, and drunkards' maudlin talk—yea, oaths and curses, and dying moans, all *may* be used as a means for building up the life of man in the economy of human growth.

But none of these can ever come to mere beasts! Ears have they, but they hear not, as man's ears hear! No thrill of thankfulness comes to such when they are conscious of

"That blessedest, best sound
That ever greeted human ear—
The boat-keels grating on the shore!"

Beethoven's Fifth Symphony is to these like any other noise! No "concord of sweet sounds" can stir emotions in the breasts of beasts and birds, much less in flowers and trees, and lesser still in stones and mud!

But these suggestions need not be too extended. We all know what and how they are. And we all know, too, if we stop to think about it, that all these significant sounds, and all they signify together with all the feelings and emotions they arouse, make up the *plus of humanity* as it exists through what mankind can hear, but which no form of life below him can ever be conscious of, at least not to the extent of reacting therefrom!

Having pointed out these plusses that come to humanity by means of eyes and ears, let us go on with some conclusions that follow, as we did when studying physical appetite for food in man. In that case, we saw how the *desire* of man for better food stimulated his *imagination*, which in turn acted upon his *ingenuity*, and as a result of all these potent forces working, each after each, all the progress in human eating and drinking, and all that goes with the exercise of these qualities was realized.

By exactly the same process has the *plus of humanity* been exploited in the matter of eyesight. The *desire* of man set him longing to see more than animal eyes could see. His *imagination* took up such desires and elaborated them, and dreamed what things might be in these regards; and then man's *ingenuity* responded to what imagination had pictured as possible, and from these sources have come all the eventualities that now delight the eye of man!

And what is true of the *plus of humanity* pertaining to eyesight, is equally true regarding what *desire* and *imagination* and *ingenuity* have wrought out for men and women in the realm of sound, of tone, and all the arts that are based upon capabilities of the human ear!

These three factors which make for human progress, namely, *desire*, *imagination* and *ingenuity;* this *trinity* of *forces*, has made a *plus* of *humanity* which is so much beyond all the attainments of mere animality that these latter must be counted as of little corresponding worth! That is, the *additions* that have been made to the original possessions of mankind far exceed in value the qualities they were added to! Think of that, more than once, for it is something we shall come back to most tellingly at the proper time, and in the proper place!

Once more: Think, please, of the *help* to eyes and ears that has come to mankind at the hands of human *desire* and *imagination* and *ingenuity!* How you start, not to say rebound from the rush of thought that comes to you at the mere suggestion of such *helps* as have come to the human race from this source, as they have been applied to the *plus of humanity!* I need not enumerate these *helps* to any length, for they will march before you in an endless procession if only you will follow your own thoughts regarding them. But here are a few of these *aids* to eyes and ears, which have revealed secrets that would have forever remained hidden from human ken but for such assistance; have made an open book out of what would otherwise have been an everlastingly sealed volume; have let clear daylight in where once all was darkness and the unknown!

In this list of eye-helpers, here are the *glasses* astride my nose, which make my old eyes as good as new again, as strong and clear as they ever were, and without which I could not write a single one of the words you are now reading. And my doctor looked clear through me, even into the innermost parts of my being, a few days ago, with the help of an *X-ray* light; and with the assistance of a *microscope* I have seen what was totally invisible to my naked eye. And I once "saw stars" through a great *telescope,* till the multitude and the magnitude of them struck me dumb from amazement, and stunned me more completely than would a blow on my head with a hammer!

I need not go on with this eye-helper list, though what I have given is only a portion of what might be enumerated.

And then, think of the ear-helpers. They include all the "phones" of all sorts and descriptions whatsoever. All "phones" are ear-helpers as all the "scopes" are eye-helpers.

By one of these ear-helpers I talked with a man, an hour ago, and the chairs we sat on as we spoke together were two thousand miles apart! Our ears were "helped" to that extent!

And you are not in the least surprised as I tell you this, for you have done similar things more than once—yes, an uncounted number of times; not quite so pronounced, perhaps, but practically the same experience. And so your ears were *helped*, as mine were, and as *everybody's may be! Think of that even to the limit of what it means, with the accent on* EVERYBODY!

To make a climax of this thought, call to mind all the "scope" words, and the "phone" words, and the "graph" words that the dictionary contains, and then remember that all these words connote some *help* to eye or ear, that has come to mankind on the *plus* side of his make-up, not by *chance*, but rather as a result of *choice*, and then you will have some idea of what the *desire* of man, and his *imagination* and his *ingenuity* have wrought out for the progress and betterment of the race—for increasing the sum total of the *plus of humanity* on its eye and ear side.

And when you have realized something of what and how much all this means, will you call to mind the words I quoted many pages back, words which were written by a body of learned doctors, and which were: "We must uphold the laws of nature against man's meddling!" But let us not anticipate!

Still, I must ask, just here, if the *helping* of human faculties to realize possibilities which they could not otherwise attain to—if this is "meddling with nature's laws?" But more of this later.

And it is worthy of special mention, that, as regards the two-fold manner of expression of all the qualities that mankind possesses in common with lower orders of life, the second method far exceeds the first in promoting the progress of humanity! It is in the exercise of what belongs to the *plus of humanity* in physical appetite for food, in eyesight and in hearing, that growth and development in human beings find their greatest stimulus to become more and more. That is, the animality of what we possess in common with lower life-forms is the lesser half of such belongings, so far as the results which come from their expression are concerned; and the higher man ascends in the scale of spiritual life, the smaller and of less value becomes the animality that is still a fundamental part of his make-up. It is equally true that, as the material part of man grows less and less, the *plus* that has grown out of it, and which is still seated in it, becomes more and more supreme both in force and in intrinsic value.

This is a principle which holds good with regard to *all the qualities* and characteristics which man has in common with mere animal life. *Verbum sat!*

CHAPTER VI

THE THREE I'S

THE three I's which I am going to consider in this chapter are *Instinct*, *Impulse* and *Intuition*, and I take up their special study, just here, because definite thinking regarding them is essential to the further, and especially the final conclusions which I am aiming at.

In defining these words, and in the applications I make of them as they stand related to my theme, I may differ somewhat from current ideas as to what these several combinations of vowels and consonants stand for; but I shall try to make my own conception of their significance clear, and shall be equally explicit in the use to which I put their meanings; and hence there will be no danger of misunderstanding in what I have to say—which is really the main thing.

All these powers, or qualities which are indicated by these three words, have much to do with, or are greatly involved in, the outworkings of the life-force, as it expresses itself in time and space. What I wish to point out is something of the nature of each, of the mission of each, and of the purpose that each serves in the different and varied organisms, or life-forms, which each has to do with in this world.

Instinct: I speak of *instinct* first because it is the most primary of all these qualities, and it exercises an influence upon a greater number of life-forms, both as to multitude and variety, than do either of the others.

In speaking of what is included in this word, *instinct*, I want to confine its meaning to a somewhat narrower range than that given it by some others. Indeed, the dictionaries give it a wider meaning than it seems to me it is rightly entitled to when they make it a synonym for "intellect" and "intelligence." My own belief is that *instinct, per se,* has very little, if anything, in common with either *intellect* or *intelligence,* when we come to the exact meaning of these words. And here is what makes me hold to such opinion:

Some wise Hindoo philosopher has defined instinct in a way that better describes its real significance than I have ever seen elsewhere expressed. He says: "Instinct is the totality of life's efforts to preserve itself in material form." The point I call particular attention to in this definition is, that it confines the actions and influences of instinct entirely to the material plane, dealing only with material means, and producing only material results. This is an item of the utmost significance in the subject we are now studying.

Perhaps it may tend to make this quality stand out more clearly in its real nature, to say that it is no integral part of the life-form which it inhabits, so to speak. That is, it is *in*, but not *of* the organism upon which it acts. It is in this essential respect that it differs from *impulse* and *intuition*, as I shall presently show.

The chief characteristics of *instinct* are that it *compels* the acts which it originates, and that all the deeds that are done at its bidding are enacted according to a *must* and not to a *may* or *can*. That is, the element of *choice*, which, you will remember, is the chief item I am talking about, has nothing in common with *instinct!*

Let us illustrate: Birds build their nests by *instinct*. But they have no *choice* in their way and manner of building! Indeed, it is even doubtful if they even *choose* a place or a spot for locating their nests. The probabilities are that the same power that enables them to build their nests, directs them where to place them to best suit the purpose they are to serve. Where this power comes from, and how it is hitched up to the organisms which utilize it are not any part of this discussion. I am studying what it does, and how it does it, and not whence it came or whither it goes!

I say birds build their nests by *instinct*, and it is a curious fact that they do this just as well the first time as the last. And they never have to be taught how to do the work, in either case! True, different kinds of birds build different sorts of nests; but each kind builds its particular nest in the same way, ever and always. Later generations make no improvements upon the earlier forms which their ancestors constructed, but over and over, the same thing in the same way—this is always the manner of work that is done at the bidding or command of *instinct.*

That is, *instinct makes no progress,* either in the work that is done at its bidding, or in the life-forms that do that work. It acts upon, or through, a life-form, and produces results which are of service to the form it controls; but that form has no power other than to follow its dictates, to obey its absolute commands.

All of which means that creatures of instinct are guided by an intelligence which does not originate in, or emanate from, the form which gives it expression. The point I want to bear down on, and to have you be sure to keep in mind is, that creatures which are guided by instinct are not creatures of *choice,* in so far as their acts are *instinctive.* That is, as I have said before, *instinct* and *choice* have no common factor. Instinct is grounded in *must,* it knows nothing of *may* or *can.*

Impulse: The derivation of the word *impulse* gives the key to its essential meaning, and furnishes a hint as to how it differs from *instinct*. If you will think of the word *impel* which has the same root as the word impulse, you may be helped to catch its true significance. In both these words there is the idea of throwing, or pushing, of movement or motion which *may* be resisted, or may be let run!

And now notice the something which appears in such condition which has no place in the case of *instinct*. When one is moved to action by instinct, he *must* do as he does; but when one is *impelled* to do this or that, he may do it or not, *as he chooses!* And there is all the difference in the world between these two conditionings! The one introduces the possibility of exercising the *power of choice*. The other knows nothing of such factor as a determining force resulting in action.

And right in there is where the infinite difference between man and the animals below him obtains! Animals are creatures of *instinct alone*. Man is a creature of *instinct, in some respects;* that is, to a degree, in the part of himself which is merely animal; and here it has to do only with the material part of man, and never rises into the plane of his mental and spiritual being, in its activities; and hence, so far as the *plus* in man is concerned, with *this, instinct* has little or nothing whatever to do! Drive a peg there!

Again: *Nothing that is done at the bidding of* *instinct, merely, ever results in character!* And there is another wonderful thing to think about! Character is built up by the exercise of the *power of choice.* Animals cannot choose, and so they have no characters—that is, they are not possessed of an individual something of their own, which they have acquired from an expenditure of energy which they put forth by means of their own *will.* But man can choose. He can *follow* an impulse or he can *reject* it. And it is by his *decisions* as to which of these he will do that he builds himself a character.

Now, character can only be built out of the stuff that is included in the *plus of humanity.* It can never be formed out of mere materiality, or by any action of that which works in the realm of the material alone. All there is in man which is below the line of that plus, and which is ruled by *instinct* alone, can never result in character.

True, as has just been said, man has in him, in some degree, that which is instinctive! He has come up through the life-forms below him, and much of what they were made of still sticks to him. But the material part of man is one thing, and the mental and spiritual part is another, and an entirely different thing.

All mankind begins life in the realm of *instinct.* The baby does not have to be taught to suck milk from its mother any more than a kitten or a calf does. And so it gains no character from its suck-ing! It simply responds to a physical appetite for food, reduced to its lowest terms, namely, to keep itself alive, and instinct compels it to yield to its dictates in this regard. That is, at this stage of man's being, life's efforts are solely to maintain itself in material form. In other words, all human beings begin life on the animal plane!

But as the child grows and begins to yield to, or reject its *impulses* which its *desires* suggest, its *imagination* pictures and its *ingenuity* makes possible of realization, that is, as he *chooses* in these matters by an exercise of his will, by such acts he forms an individuality, a personality, a character which is all his own, and which no mere animal can ever attain to. And all of this is wrought out on the plane of the *plus of humanity!*

I hope I have made a clear distinction between the meanings of the words *instinct* and *impulse* as I shall use them later on in this discussion. I have been obliged to define them as carefully as I have, because of the loose way in which these words are used, even in the best of good circles. For instance, in one of the best of English dictionaries, I find this: "*Instinct* is a natural *impulse.*" No! That won't do, at least not for this discussion. *Instinct* is one thing, and *impulse* is another thing, in what I am talking about, namely, the *plus of humanity.* Within the realm of this attainment in man, instinct has nothing whatever to do. But with it *impulse* has much to do, for it offers the possibility of exercising the power of choice, and the exercise of this power makes for progress, and *progress is the purpose of all human life!*

Once more: Since the major half of all the qualities which man and animals have in common has, to a great extent, as I have already shown, been lifted out of the plane of mere animalism and promoted into the realm of the *plus of humanity*, it follows that *instinct* is no longer a sufficient guide for the control and extension of these qualities. All that has to do with the *plus of humanity* is capable of progress, of improvement. But *instinct* does not make for progress. It requires *impulse*, rectified by choice, by a direct act of the will. to result in betterment, in growth.

And this means that everything that *impulse* has to do with is capable of improvement through education. But *instinct* does not educate; and to leave to *instinct* the management of elements in the human make-up which should be under the control of the will, which should be guided by choice, is to make a gross and grave mistake. And gross and grave mistakes always have to be paid for, times over!

So much for *instinct* and *impulse*.

Intuition: The derivation of this word *intuition* will help its understanding. Considered in this way, it means "taught from within." In some respects it is like *instinct*, namely, that, in a way, it seems to be *in* rather than *of* the body it inhabits. And, again, it does not have to be taught, to be educated. Indeed, the probabilities are that attempts to educate intuition do more harm than good!

This quality is possessed to a higher degree by women than by men, and it is especially manifest in geniuses of all sorts and descriptions. It enables its possessor to know things without learning them by laborious processes, and to do things without much thinking about the way or the means of accomplishing desired results.

But there is one respect in which it differs materially from *instinct*, namely, that it practically requires of its possessor a *judgment* as to whether its teachings are correct or not. That is, intuition is not an infallible guide—surely not, as it exists in most of us. We cannot trust it implicitly, as the bird can trust its *instinct* implicitly. And that is why we have to judge its promptings.

In this respect, *intuition* is much more like *impulse* than it is like *instinct*, and its usefulness as a character-former comes from this manner of its working. Its utilization in the economy of human life involves the use of the will and the exercise of the *power of choice*, and that is what brings it into the realm of the *plus of humanity*, and makes it a valuable asset in the program of mankind.

There are those who claim that *intuition* is to mankind what *instinct* is to animals, and in some respects, as I have already intimated, this is true. Both these qualities have a common characteristic —that they do not take their rise from an initial will-exercise on the part of their possessors. They lead to, or compel actions, rather than suggest them merely, as is the case with *impulse*, and in this regard they are much alike.

But there is one great difference between *instinct* and *intuition*, as follows: *Instinct* is universal in its applications, as it were; that is, it is a constant factor in *all* the actions of the beings it controls. *Intuition*, on the other hand, is sporadic, or partial, in its appearance and work, and only controls a part, or perhaps a few, of the acts of the individuals in which it manifests itself. Where it is truly present, it is often all-powerful and may be left to a safe supremacy. But it is not always present in mankind, as instinct is always present in animals.

The result of this is that creatures which are governed by instinct never need to be taught along any of the lines on which this faculty is their constant and natural guide; and this includes practically all their native doings. On the other hand, since *intuition* is only partial in its presence and workings, wherever it is lacking the individual must be taught what to do and how to do it. He must be given the benefit of the former experiences of his kind by careful, intelligent instruction, and not left to shift for himself in ways that he knows not of intuitively.

On all the lines of life on which any individual has intuitive knowedge, he can readily and safely go his own gait, without aid or assistance from any, but such manifestations are only partial, at best, in any one personality, so far as their number is concerned, and wherever they are not present, there, the individual needs instruction and help from others, to be taught and guided by the former experiences of those who have gone over the road which he must travel; who know the way, and so can point it out to those who come after.

This is a most vital difference between *instinct* and *intuition*, as they apply to human life and actions as we shall see later. As a special factor in the realms included in this study, that is, in the *plus of humanity*, intuition manifests itself in what are known as "affinities," of which more definite treatment will be given at the proper time and place.

Instinct, Impulse, Intuition; Desire, Imagination, Ingenuity:—To have clear ideas regarding these six factors that have to do with the out-workings of the life-force as it manifests itself in the human family in this world, is absolutely essential to success in comprehending the problems which all progress presents, and much more in solving these same problems as they appear in so many and in such varied forms.

CHAPTER VII

SOMETHING OF WHAT ALL THESE THINGS HAVE TO DO WITH CHILDREN BY CHANCE OR BY CHOICE

THAT it is *possible* for children to be brought into this world by *choice* rather than by *chance* is a fact that is well known by all intelligent people. And will you stop and think for a minute that man is the only created being in which this *possibility* exists! Mere animals have no choice whatsoever as to how many offspring they shall produce, or when and under what circumstances their descendants shall come into this world.

In all these realms of life-forms, matings which result in reproduction are only possible under predetermined conditions, and with these conditions, the individual *will* of the parties concerned has nothing whatever to do. They have no *choice* whatever in the premises. They do as they *must* and not at all as they *may*. The whole affair is governed and controlled by *instinct* alone, and with it neither *impulse* nor *intuition* has anything whatsover to do.

And it is because of these facts that the whole affair of reproduction, in the human species, is lifted above the plane of *instinct*, and rises into the realm of a governable *impulse*, a condition wherein *choice* becomes possible and the human *will* is a factor to be reckoned with. These conditions show that this part of man's life, namely, the reproductive part, and all that pertains thereto, belongs in the realm of the *plus of humanity*, and not in the plane of mere animality! And when we have that point established, we see how futile, not to say criminal, it is to longer hold to the doctrine that the bringing of children into time and space should be left to *instinct*, and that the laws of life that obtain in the lower forms of being should be declared as applicable to human beings! Moreover, these facts force one to ask the question: Shall attempts which are made to better conditions with regard to human reproduction be counted as "meddling" with nature's laws? And the reply which cannot be other than correct must be: As well say that the whole science and art of obstetrics is "meddling with nature's laws" as to say that the science and art of reproduction of the human species, under the control of the human will (that is, by *choice*) is tampering with what ought to be let alone! Such answer is only good common sense, and in our heart of hearts, we know that it is true.

As well say that, because mere animals require no assistance in parturition, therefore human mothers should be left to shift for themselves when their birth-pangs come! And, to be really honest about it, even such teaching as this has not been without its advocates in days gone by! Worse than all, such doctrine has been held and taught by those who were supposed to be engaged in building up and bettering humanity, namely, those who were the religious leaders of the race! For ages it was held by good religious people that because our mother, Eve, ate the apple and was cursed therefor, that, for this reason, all women were forever doomed "in sorrow to bring forth" children, and that any attempt to lessen such sorrow and suffering was acting contrary to God's purpose, and "meddling with nature's laws!" It does not seem possible, viewed in the light of modern obstetrical practice, that such a condition could ever have existed, but it did exist!

But now that old order is passing away, and a new order is superseding it. *Choice*, rather than *chance*, has taken its place at the bedside of human births, greatly to the benefit of all parties concerned; and by the same token, the old order of begetting children by *chance* shall one day pass, and be numbered among the things that were; and in its stead shall come a new order of conception by *choice*, of fatherhood and motherhood by a deliberate exercise of the human *will*, rather than at the hands of chance and of animal instinct merely!

If the *plus of humanity* means anything, it must mean this; and that it does mean just this, there can be no shadow of doubt in any thoughtful mind. The great question is, how shall such righteous and rightful conditions be brought about and made effective?

And let no one say that it is an impossible task that is thus presented, simply because conditions are as they now are, and the means of making them better are so difficult to handle that the outcomes must be generations away. The hardest lesson man has to learn is to "patiently wait." Theodore Parker once said that the one great difference between God and himself was that The Almighty was never in a hurry, and he was!

It may help us to be patient under the circumstances, to remember that it was two hundred and fifty years after the discovery that the earth is round before the fact was acknowledged in institutions which were counted as leaders of truth for mankind! It was much more than a century after Franklin lured electricity from the clouds before this force was utilized by mankind, made to light up the dark places of the earth, turn millions of wheels, and run on errands under the sea and through the sky. It takes time for things to grow, often a long time. "Presto, pass!" are the words of a fakir, but they are not Nature's words, nor God's words! So it is no reason why the study of this great problem should not be undertaken because of the difficulties that are involved in its solution, or the probability that its correct answer will be so long in the finding.

When we look this problem squarely in the face, and read it and analyze it so as to get at the very core of its meaning, we find that, while it propounds a great number of highly interesting and important questions, as the subjects it presents are seen from different points of view, yet the fundamental item on all counts is located in one great issue, namely: *Is it in accordance with the rightful order of human development that sex should serve any other purpose for the human race than that of reproduction?* I write the question in this particular form for those who prefer to consider the issue from a purely scientific standpoint. But because there are many who would rather view it from another angle (if they will seriously think of what it really means at all) I will put the question into other words, as follows: "*Was it God's intent in making man that sex in the human family should serve any other purpose than that of reproduction?*"

Now, I ask you, whoever you are who read the questions I have just written, to answer one or the other, or both of them, whichever you prefer, honestly and squarely; and to acknowledge, to yourself, at least, the full force of the answer you give, and to be willing to stand by and defend your answer, not theoretically only, but *by your own acts and deeds* —your own way of living, whoever you are!

And I ask this of you because the argument I am making is not based on theories, or statistics, or "authorities," but on the personal experiences of the men and women whom I know, and whom you know —yes, closer home than that, namely on your experiences and mine, which are the ultimate tests in these matters, so far as we are concerned. You need not answer to me, nor to any one but yourself; but answer to yourself as a person whom you can decently respect, so far as your alleged beliefs and your real practices are concerned!

Regardless of what your personal answer may or may not be, it is only fair to set down, as a part of this record, what the almost universal theory and practice of civilized mankind have been, especially that part of mankind that you and I are most familiar with, and know most about. Among these, you know, and I know, for we have grown up under such conditions, the theory regarding this great issue has been one thing, and the universal practice, especially among married men and women, has been an entirely different thing! Among practically all these people, the announced belief has been that the sole function of sex in the human family is that of reproduction, and that *any other exercise of that function is a sin of greater or less magnitude!*

To be sure, such practice has always been counted as a sin that could be more or less winked at, or condoned, in wedlock, where it could be legalized, so far as man-made laws were concerned. But still, even there, it has been held, so far as teachings and theoretical beliefs are concerned, that things would be far better than they are if the whole sex side of human life could be eliminated or inhibited, other than for reproductive purposes; and there are those who hold that even for such purposes other and better ways of perpetuating the species might have been devised! If one doubts these assertions, read Paul's declaration that "It is better to marry than to burn," or the statement of the Psalmist who says: "We are conceived in sin and born in iniquity."

It is not pleasant to write these things, but an honest inquiry into the real truths of the proposition we are considering demands that they be made a part of the record in compiling any comprehensive statement of the subject in hand. Practically, the theory of this part of human life and experience has been that sex in humanity is a debased and debasing quality, that any exercise of its functions, even for reproduction, tends to lower the character of the parties to the act; and that any and all other expressions of this part of humanity's make-up is sinful and so should be avoided to the utmost possible degree.

Such has been the theory of the Christian Church from its very beginning, in any and all of its many and varied sects and denominations. Some of these have been more pronounced than others in asserting their special beliefs on the subject; but all have practically agreed in their teachings regarding it. Tomes and volumes have been written to substantiate such beliefs, and those in authority in these institutions have taught the doctrine, earnestly and continually through the years.

As an historical fact, these views of the early Christian era were based on a general contempt for the human body, and for all material things, because it was held by these early believers that the world was to come to an end very shortly, and that the chief interest in this life was to prepare for a life to come, which might be entered upon at almost any moment. It was for this cause that religion became the chief factor in life in that era, and took the form of an other-worldliness, rather than of correct modes of living while in the physical body. So comprehensive was this view of life and living that the principles it involved were made to apply to everything that men and women had to do with. It affected what they ate and what they drank, and wherewithal they were clothed, and it specially pronounced against "meddling" with things, by way of attempting to change them from what "God made them," as witness this quotation from one of the ancient Fathers, who wrote: "The purpose of clothing is to defend the body against excess of cold and intensity of heat, and the simplest materials are sufficient for the purpose. The Christian woman must therefore bid farewell to embroidery of gold and

Indian silks; she is strictly forbidden to wear gold ornaments of any kind, and she is to avoid all dyed clothes, as dye is unnecessary for health, afflicts greedy eyes, and, moreover, it is false; *for God would have made sheep purple if he had wished woolen clothes to be purple!*" The italicized words are mine, but they show very plainly the extent to which this protest against "meddling with nature's ways" was carried in those far days. That a good deal of this spirit has descended to modern times is evident to all who will study into the origin of many of the ways and customs of today.

Doubtless the people who developed these views felt that they had good and sufficient reasons for maintaining them. There is no need of blaming them, or of saying hard things about them. Take them by and large, most people believe in doing what seems to them best, take it all in all; and it behooves us all to be charitable. Still, while we may not condemn the authors of great mistakes, it is nothing short of folly to persist in upholding their errors after it is discovered that they were wrong in the opinions and beliefs they held. And the fact that such authors of errors were counted as great, or even holy people in their day, should have no weight as a reason for the continuation of policies and deeds which they inaugurated, but which time has proven were not based in truth.

Added to these Christian theorizers and teachers, there have arisen, from time to time, men and women who have assumed to consider this subject of correct sex-life less from a religious, and more from an alleged strictly logical point of view. And from them the uniform statement of the case, on its theoretical side, has been as follows:

(a) Man is an animal.

(b) Among animals the sole purpose of sex is reproduction.

(c) Therefore, in man the sole purpose of sex is reproduction.

Practically all the books "For Young Men" and "For Young Women" contain this syllogism in one form or another. And to such conclusion their writers have always added the corollary that, since the sole function of sex in the human family is reproduction, any other exercise of such faculty is contrary to nature, and therefore positively wrong. And because it is rightfully held that it is the business of life to overcome wrong doing, believers in this doctrine maintain that everything possible ought to be done, individually and collectively, to eliminate, crush out, kill and totally annihilate this part of the human make-up, except such a modicum of it as may be needful to keep the race from perishing off the face of the earth!

Such are the theories which have been taught to the generations that you and I are descended from, through all the Christian Era, at least, and even before that time, in some lands, and under some conditions. If you know of a book or a treatise on this subject which the common people have ever been, or are now permitted to read, which teaches any other doctrine than this, you have found something that I have never yet discovered. In a word, the teachers of the civilized world of today, religious and alleged logically scientific, are proclaiming this doctrine early and late, and it is practically the only instruction that the common people have, or can in any way procure, regarding this part of their lives! It was taught to me, and I am very sure that it was taught to you. More than that, it was taught to us *very early in our lives,* if we were taught anything at all regarding this part of our being; and what is taught us very early in our lives takes a *mighty hold on us,* and its influence on our subsequent existence is inestimable! I shall make special mention of this fact later on in my argument, for it is a factor whose significance is more forceful than is generally known in the social life of today.

On the other hand, in spite of these theories, doctrines and teachings regarding the mission of sex in the human race, the *practices* of the overwhelming majority of mankind and womankind have been utterly at variance with what they have been taught, and with their professed beliefs! As I have already said, within the bounds of wedlock such practices have been legalized by man-made laws, and not only so, but submission to such practice has been made legally compulsory, on the part of wives, with the penalty of divorce if they refuse to submit to such demands on the part of their husbands! This is "common law," and some form of such law still exists in all modern civilized lands, states and nations! To tell the whole story, it should be added that, outside of the limits of marriage, nearly all men, and very many women have lived and are now living sex lives which were and are contrary to their sex creeds! These are matters of common knowledge; but they are equally matters of common hush-up, say-nothing-about-it, and taboo sort! Abas!

And it might as well be said here as later, that such a conditioning of these basic affairs of human life is about as bad as could possibly be devised if the purpose of such exploiting was to work ruin to human character. The reason for this is, that because of this variance between announced beliefs and actual practices, all classes of men and women in the Christian world today are *obliged to live a continual lie, or a series of continual lies! And to live continual lies is the most debasing and soul-destroying experience that a human being can be subjected to!*

Let all of us who have, all our lives, been obliged to be the victims of such continual falsifications sum up, just here, if we can, the total of what their effects have been, and still are, upon our characters!

Try not to flinch from this stand-and-deliver challenge, as it appeals to *you* personally.

(The further I get into this writing, the more I realize that it is chiefly a personal affair, a sort of heart-to-heart talk between you and me. And it is better, yes, best, so! It is only as individuals can be personally touched and moved to action that real and permanent results can be obtained! This is a root principle in all social and ethical changes or reforms. This is why I ask you to bring yourself and your own personal experiences in sex life to the test of the truth or falsity of these theories and their exposition. Let these stand or fall, not by what books or "authorities" say about them, not as they tally with or are contrary to history, conventional traditions and man-made laws, but solely as they fit your experiences and mine, for such is the court of final appeal in what is of real moment to us, or to any!)

And so I ask you again to ask yourself, and to *insist on an answer*, whether it has been to your benefit or for your harm, that you have been compelled to live a continual sex-lie all your life? You need not answer to me, but I beseech you, as you are an honest man or woman, to answer to yourself, whoever you are! Be honest now! Don't "side-step" the whole affair by saying "who cares?" or "we don't own it"! If you are a man or a woman who counts one in a civilization of which you cannot help being a part, you must "care" for you do "own" your share of these affairs.

And yet, we are not so much nor so wondrously to blame, you, or I, or any, for these lying modes of sex-living that we have been practically forced into, all our lives. We have only done as we have been taught to do, and as all our elders and example-setters have taught and done before us, time out of mind!

Truth to tell, we had mighty little real teaching regarding our sex-life, one way or another, any of us; on this score, the anomalous condition has obtained that here, the knowledge gained by one generation (if any such knowledge which was of permanent value was really gained) should not be passed on to those following, but that each generation should begin over, and find its own way in these matters, *de novo,* just as if no one had ever known anything about such part of human life before, and that "*instinct would take care of all these affairs*"*!* So let us not be too hard upon ourselves and our deeds in these regards, because of these facts. On the other hand, let us not be content to continue in our blindness and our lying ways of living, now that the truth has been pointed out to us! But more of this later.

Now, it is out of these utterly false conditions, these pronounced differences between alleged beliefs *and contrary practices regarding sex life and sex functioning, that the result of "children by chance" has come to be the practically universal rule for the perpetuation of the human species!* For we all know that at least ninety-nine per cent of the children who are born into the world today, are begotten by *chance* rather than by *choice!*

(And again I say that I am not bringing statistics or "authorities" to prove my assertions, but that I base their truthfulness solely upon your experiences and mine! How did you or your children begin to be? Answer that honestly, and I am sure I shall be safe in basing my per cent assertion on your reply!)

The reasons for this condition of affairs are as follows:

Reverting to the principles which I set forth in the early chapters of this book, it is certain that the reproduction of the species in mere animal life is not a matter of *chance* at all, but one of definite certainty. More than that, it is not a matter of *choice*, either, in any degree, with any form of life below man. In all such realms of life-expression, *instinct* is the sole guide and cause of reproduction; and as we have clearly seen, *instinct* knows nothing of either *chance* or *choice!* It is a matter of compulsion, pure and simple, and that is all there is of it.

But in the human family, sex expression rises from the plane of *instinct* into the realm of *impulse*, and so comes under the possible control of *choice*, and the human *will;* and hence the method of dealing with it is entirely removed from that of the manner of its exercise in the brute creation! I am well aware that I have said this before; but it is so important that it needs to be said not only again, but many, many times.

And it is because mankind has not recognized this all-important fact, that this disagreement between theory and practice in sex-living has grown up in the human species. Men and women (and especially men), have kept their *theories* on the instinct-limiting plane of mere animality, while they have given their practices free rein under the larger range of willful possibility of sex-exercise which has come to mankind as a necessary part of the *plus of humanity!*

In all the realms of life below humanity, sex-exercise is only possible when the female is compelled by her instinct to desire to reproduce. And it is also true that the males in these life-forms never offer their services for any other purpose than reproduction, and then only when their natural mates are fully prepared for, and desire, impregnation. At no other time does the sex-instinct appear so far as mutual sex-expression is concerned.

But this is not the case in the human race! In this realm of life-forms, sex-expression rises above the realm of *instinct* into that of *impulse,* and this sex-impulse is possible of expression under the control of the will, in all normal adults, of both sexes, practically at all times! The desire to reproduce has little or nothing to do with the possibility of such expression in human beings. In all other forms of life, such desire is absolutely essential to sex-manifestation; and without it, such phenomena are not only unknown, but positively impossible. This fact forms one of the greatest and most significant differences between man and the lower forms of life that is within the ken of human knowledge.

And just here is where the trouble comes in, in the most intimate relations of married men and women. Being legally, religiously and respectably granted the possibility of sex-exercise at any time, regardless of whether reproduction is desired or not, human beings, especially the male portion thereof, and in many cases the female as well, have treated this added quality as though it were on a par with the animality of mere *instinct,* and have not subjected it to the control of the *will,* under whose wise guidance only can it fulfill the purpose it was meant to serve. That is, sex having been promoted into the *plus of humanity,* its exercise has been indulged in as though it were still only a brute possession!

And it is because of this condition of affairs that the begetting of progeny in the human family has become a matter of chance! Because sex-exercise is constantly possible for adult human beings, and such expression is indulged in indiscrimately by married men and women, regardless of whether it results in reproduction or not; and because conception is always liable to result from such meetings, unless it has already taken place—because these things are as they are, the impregnation of the wife is liable to occur at any embrace; that is, as I have already said, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, conception, in the married relation, is a matter of *chance*, pure and simple, and not one of certainty, much less one of *choice*. And again I say that I do not attempt to substantiate this statement by statistics, nor by the testimony of "authorities." Your own experiences as a husband or a wife have demonstrated its truthfulness, and you know it as well as any one.

These facts bring us face to face with the problem stated in the title of this book, and they also connect up all the earlier chapters I have written, with the main subject in hand. They also point unerringly to the real causes of most of the troubles in married life, according to the fundamental principle that when *chance* is permitted to control affairs which were intended to be guided and managed by *choice* and the human will, success under such conditions is not only extremely improbable, but, as a matter of fact, it is practically impossible!

How successfully could a railroad, or any other business concern be run, if it were exploited by *chance* alone? Surely, nothing but disaster and ruin could ever come under such conditions, except by the constant exercise of miracles to avert such calamities. And miracles are not of frequent appearance in these days; surely not to the extent that their intervention must be relied upon as the only certain road leading to the success of the enterprise undertaken! And yet, in the greatest of all enterprises in which humanity can be engaged, namely, the bringing of children into this world, we still permit *chance* to be the main factor in the premises!

But, though all these things are so, learned bodies of doctors still issue their manifesto that "we must not meddle with nature's ways," and legislators make laws which demand the punishment by fine and imprisonment of any one who disseminates knowledge as to how children can be born other than by *chance!*

It is because of this condition of affairs that it would seem to be wise to try earnestly to find out what "nature's ways" are, as they apply to sex in humanity.

CHAPTER VIII

SOME STUDIES AS TO THE REAL MISSION OF SEX IN THE HUMAN SPECIES

Putting together the several arguments and demonstrations I have so far made, does not the thought occur that it is quite possible that *sex has two modes of expression in the human family, just as appetite for food has two modes of expression, and eyesight has two, and hearing has two?*

You will remember that I spoke of the two modes of expression of physical appetite for food, as this quality exists in mankind, as materially-constructive and esthetically-upbuilding, respectively; and I gave similar namings to the double forms of expression in the matter of human eyesight and of hearing. The first of all these modes of expression, in each case and severally, is the most primary, and deals almost entirely with the material make-up of mankind. The second, in each case, pertains wholly to the *plus of humanity*, and its exercise is only possible where such *plus* exists. On the other hand, *its rightful exercise is absolutely essential to the growth* *and development of such plus* (given that addition to man's material organism).

Now, it is on this basis that the probability appears, and on examination of the facts in the case, it becomes a positive certainty, that sex also has two forms of expression in the human species, the first of which is most primary and deals largely with the material make-up of mankind; while the second, which belongs entirely to the *plus of humanity*, serves a wholly esthetic purpose, namely, the upbuilding, the growth and the development of this *plus*, whose existence makes the exercise of this form of sex-expression possible.

On this basis, the first of these modes of sex-expression is the reproductive; the second may well be called the "affectional," a word which finely denotes the scope and significance of this form of human sex-manifestation. Looked at in this way, the first of these manifestations is, primarily, of the earth earthy, and may descend as low in its exercise as the plane of mere brutality. The second is God-born, and may include in its realization everything between the most blissful of physical delights and all the raptures that come from the scaling of mental and spiritual heights. The first may be only like a prose statement of a dire necessity; the second, in its rightful expressions, is like poetry with all the lilt and rhythm of the most perfect of cadences. The first may be only like the harsh noise of a clumsy machine; the second may be music in its most heavenly forms! The first, in itself alone, is a mere matter of fact; the second takes the imagination for its partner, in its journeyings, and the twain together may explore all the realms of beauty in time and space. The first may be coldly scientific, merely; the second may be fanciful to a limitless degree. The first may be only ice; the second may always be sunshine. The first, *per se*, is bald reality; the second is, at its best, an idealized dream come true. The first has animal *instinct* for its base; the second is grounded in a divine *impulse* inspired by human love. The first, considered on the physical-utility plane only, has but one aim in view, but one reason for its existence, namely, the perpetuation of the human species; the second includes in its purpose and usefulness the upbuilding of the whole human life, from the extreme lowliness of its material existence to the highest reaches of man's spiritual being. The first may be exploited on the demand of one party, in its gross fulfillment; and the second is realized only by the mutual desire and consent of both parties concerned. The first may be a matter of compulsion, or coercion even; the second must always be the free-will offering of love. The first may be counted as a legal right and be enforced as such; the second knows nothing of rights or duties, and if either of these even knocks at its doors, it flies out at the window instantly. The first may pertain to the physical body only, and can continue to exist on the material plane alone; the second is an adjunct of the *plus of humanity,* and must be exercised on that plane if it lives and flourishes according to the intent of its existence.

Now, I am not misrepresenting in writing thus of the first mode of sex-expression, when considered by itself alone; nor am I rhapsodising in saying what I have of its second form of manifestation. There are many who read what I have written who can testify to the truthfulness of my words, as they apply to each manner of sex-living as they exist among husbands and wives.

Perhaps I ought to add that under normal conditions, and when men and women come to the full realization of their possibilities as human beings, there is a mingling of these two forms of sex-life, which makes for a perfect harmony between the material and the spiritual, the human and the divine, the earthly and the heavenly. Such condition is well known to many men and women, and it is easily comparable to the results which come from the double expression of human physical appetite for food, as we have already seen this to be, and such analogy is almost perfect.

Thus the body can be kept alive by the solitary devouring of raw meat and unground grain. But such is not human living; it is the life of beasts! Furthermore, what all the accompaniments of table furnishings, and well prepared foods and drinks, and social converse, and mutual delights of breaking bread together,—what all these do in the exercise of physical appetite, on the plane of the *plûs of humanity*, for the upbuilding and development of mankind (and the same thing is true in the case of eyesight and hearing), all this, and more, the exercise of the "affectional" mode of sex-expression does for humanity through the exploitation of this part of its make-up!

And to contend that the reproductive element in sex-expression is the only rightful way in which this part of man's being can be exercised, is on a par with insisting that the partaking of food for the purpose of "keeping up the body," merely, is the only way in which human physical appetite can be rightly utilized! Or that the only use of eyesight is to guide one's steps aright, or that of ears merely to tell where danger lies. More than this, to declare that any attempt to realize the possible best in *both* these modes of sex-expression, by means of man's ingenuity, is "meddling with nature's ways," is like saying that all efforts to produce delicious foods and artistic table furnishings are wrongdoing; or that the making of pictures or the printing of books, or the singing of songs or the playing of musical instruments is a sin!

All of which means that *sex, as it exists in the human species requires both the reproductive and the* *affectional modes of expression, in order that it may fulfill its real mission as a factor in human life.*

There is no escape from this conclusion if one admits the *plus of humanitu* as an attainment in human life!

For, as soon as one admits the existence of the *plus of humanity*, he observes that the possession of such *plus* puts mankind wholly outside of and above the plane of mere animality; and just so soon it follows that all the qualities that men and women possess in common with life-forms below them have *two* forms of expression instead of one, and that *both of these must be given the exercise which their very nature demands in order that their possessors may grow and develop normally, and in harmony with the essential laws of their being.*

Reviewing somewhat further these two modes of sex-expression in the human family, it may help somewhat to a better understanding of the situation to say, regarding the first, that even this, which is very closely related to the same sort of functioning in the brute creation, since it results in the reproduction of the species, differs essentially from mere animality in its exercise, since, in mankind it is a matter of *impulse* under the possible control of the will, while in the brutes it is an affair of *instinct* only, with which *will* and *choice* have, and can have, nothing whatever to do. And it is because of this essential difference which exists between sex-functioning on the reproductive side in mankind and in the brute creation, that the principles and practices which apply in one case do not and cannot apply in the other. Amongst animals there is neither any danger, or even any possibility of injustice or harm, or any similar evil results arising, for any of the parties concerned, from sex-functioning, on this plane, since the whole affair is under the guidance and control of a power or a force which prevents any excess in this particular form of life-force-expression, namely, ***instinct***. More than this, sex-exercise is never engaged in, nor is it possible in the brute creation, without the mutual consent and pronounced desire of *both* parties to the act! This is a factor of supreme moment, and hence is one which demands more than a passing notice.

This is so, for the reason that amongst men and women who may legally cohabit, that is, amongst husbands and wives, mutual consent, or even mutual desire for sex-exercise is not only not required, but its fulfillment can be exacted on the part of one of the individuals concerned, even against the positive protest, or even the pronounced resistance of the other party to the act. Not only is this so, but such compulsory submission, even if carried to the extent of physical force is sustained and buttressed by law, where the parties are married; and to refuse to yield to such demands subjects those who thus deny the exercise of a legal marital right to penalties so severe that, as a rule, the sufferers prefer to bear the ills they have rather than to fly to others that they know not of. And I need not quote statistics to prove this assertion either!

The question remains, can anything be done to make these conditions better than they now are; and, if so, what? To answer such questions fairly, intelligently and satisfactorily, it will help to look into history for a space, and to inquire how it has come about that these conditions are as they are.

If we go back far enough into the past, the unpleasant, yet undeniable fact appears that marriage was, in its early estate, a form of slavery, pure and simple. Wives were stolen in those old days, and like any other piece of filched property they were subjected to any uses which their captors chose to make of them; and because these thieves were human beings, and so were possessed of the ability to exercise this sex-function at will, and because they were physically stronger than the women they stole, and so were able to coerce them, it was perfectly natural, under such conditions, that the submission of these slave wives to the sex-demands of their husbands should come into existence.

Most of the affairs of life have come into existence quite naturally, when we know all the facts that pertain to them!

Another curious and very significant fact is that found in the early history of monogamic marriage (the earliest forms of marriage were not monogamic) which had its rise among the Greek people, as follows: It was one of the tenets of some of the forms of Greek religion that the spirit of a dead man must, after his demise, be looked after by some one in this world who had the deceased one's blood in his veins. Now when this form of faith first arose, monogamy was not in practice among the Greeks, but men and women gave expression to their sex-natures according to natural desires, practically unregulated by either law, or custom or social ban. Under these conditions it is self-evident that paternity was a very uncertain affair, and that it would be exceedingly difficult for any man to be absolutely sure as to whether a child which was ostensibly his really had any of his blood in its veins. And a man had to be exceedingly careful in such matters, in those times, since the gods were supposed to know everything, and to deceive them in these affairs was therefore impossible! Under these circumstances, it became customary for men who wished to make sure in the premises to take some one woman and shut her up, where she could not meet other men, and so make sure that the children she bore had his blood in their veins! Meantime, such men themselves sustained sex-relations with other women, if they chose to do so, and were not accounted as doing wrong by that manner of living. This is one of the ways in which monogamy came into vogue amongst one of the peoples of the earth.

But there is no need of dwelling too long on these details, nor of historically establishing all the different ways in which early marital relations amongst men and women were maintained. Enough to say that, in all such relations, there was an element of slavery which persisted to a greater or less degree as time went on. And it is also true that more or less of this spirit and of its concrete expression has come down to modern times.

On the other hand, among some ancient peoples, the mother of the family was the center of the household. Her children bore her name and all property rights were vested in her. Under these conditions men were the lesser half of married life, and women were far freer and further removed from slavish conditions than when their husbands stole them and compelled them to do their bidding, irrespective of their desires or their well-being. That is, women, being economically free from the control of men, were in position to assert and maintain an independence which was impossible where men were their lords and masters. There is an item to this state of affairs which is of great importance, as we shall see later.

Chivalry had also something to do in the establishment of married relations, as they came to exist in some localities; but this form of wedded life was largely fictitious and sophisticated. It consisted almost entirely of a sentimentality which flourished to the extent of tropical profusion before marriage, but which shrunk to nothingness, or brutality, once the banns were pronounced. It consisted largely of words which seldom eventuated in deeds, in protestations which were more honored in the breach than in the observance, once the knight had possessed himself of the object of his passionate pursuit.

Remnants of many of these early marital conditions are still recognizable in our current marriage ceremonies. Thus, the ring is a mystic symbol of the shackles with which wives were chained by their captors, and the promise to "obey" is a relic of a condition of servitude which at one time obtained for all married women. The phrase "with all my earthly goods I thee endow" is a "left over" from the age of chivalry, and is as meaningless in this setting, so far as performance is concerned, as were all the rest of the voluble voicings of those gay and festive characters; while even the name wed-lock has a significance of steel-trapness that inheres in the very sound of the word itself.

Such is a brief review of some of the legal marital relations which have existed between husbands and wives in days gone by. In every case except one, namely, when the wives were the property holders of the combination, the husbands were in supreme authority, and such mastership in many cases included the power of life and death. That is, a husband could kill his wife, if he chose to do so, and none could stay his hand or say, what hast thou done?

Under such conditions, is it any wonder that men in whom there exists the constant desire for sex-exercise, should have required, or even compelled the subjection of their wives to their impulses, or what they counted as their sexual needs?

Of course, it cannot be truthfully maintained that all wives, even then as now, were or are always coerced in sex relations. Human nature being what it is, and has been through the ages, renders such a conclusion unwarranted. But the fact remains that there has always existed in the married state, the *possibility* of the coercion of the wife at the will of the husband; and that such right has not only been backed up by law, but that its exercise has been of all too frequent occurrence is a matter of common knowledge. More than this, that the exercise of such legal right on the part of the husband has been the cause of untold married unhappiness is as well known as is the fact that such right has existed.

In view of all these facts, it is easy to see where injustice and troubles have arisen between husbands and wives, both in the past and up to date. It is a fundamental principle in equity and in justice that, in all affairs where two equal personalities are concerned, nothing can rightfully be done which is not undertaken by the mutual consent of both parties to the doing. Any other mode of procedure than this is only a form of master and slave. It may not be called by such name, but the condition is really that and nothing else.

Anent which item, namely, *mutual agreement* being an absolute essential in all affairs where two equal personalities are concerned, if right and equity are to ensue, I cannot resist the temptation to call the attention of my readers to some very significant words which have been uttered in the past, from two very different sources, as follows:

There is a passage in the Bible, which, if correctly interpreted, would read: "And if two of you shall agree as touching anything, it may be done by them, for such is in harmony with the eternal order of things." And the corollary of this saying must be that, where *two* are equally concerned, and do *not* "agree as touching" the issue in hand, for *one* alone to insist on its doing, against the will of the other, cannot be "in harmony with the eternal order of things"! The saying is worthy of its author, and the common sense, as well as the experiences of mankind, prove its value as a guiding principle in *all dual* human relationships.

Another forceful saying to the same effect, but somewhat more subtle, comes to us from an ancient Chinese philosopher, who says: "Where *two* are jointly concerned, *one* must not insist!"

In no relations in life are these words more truthful and forceful than in that of marriage. And yet, always, where such disagreements and insistences as I have referred to do occur, the theory of at least one of the parties to such untoward conditions has always been that the sole mission of sex in the human species is reproduction, while the practice has been the very reverse of this, even in the face of the fact that all such extra-reproductive sex-expression was counted to be a sin! To be sure it was a legalized sin so long as it was confined to the marriage relation, and it was because of this fact that Bernard Shaw makes one of his characters say: "Marriage is one of the most licentious institutions in the world; and the reason it is so popular is that it furnishes the maximum of opportunity at the minimum of risk." "This is a hard saying, who can bear it?" But we have to bear it, or at least to acknowledge its truthfulness!

And so we return to the evident fact that sex in the human family has *two* modes of expression, namely, the *reproductive* and the *affectional;* and because in all other cases in human life where there are *two* modes of expression of any faculty, it is essential that *both* be recognized and given the opportunities for the exercise which their existence requires for the growth and development of their possessors—because these things are so, it follows that *both the reproductive and the affectional phases of* *sex-life in humanity should be provided for, and such conditions discovered and established as would make their normal fulfillment possible!* Is there any escape from this conclusion? Is there any mistake in the logic or in the facts that lead up to it, and which make it inevitable? If not, and I confess that I can find none such, let us acknowledge the situation and undertake to make provision for it, as its existence and the well-being of men and women demand. Let us conclude, once for all, that the real mission of sex in the human family is that it is meant to serve a *double* purpose, each of which is right and honorable, God-ordained, if you will, and, with this point settled, let us believe and act accordingly! Let us quit all theories which hold that the affectional expression of sex-life is a sin—*this first of all!* Indeed, let us learn that, just as the esthetical part of the appetite for food, or the cultural exercise of eye-sight or of hearing have, because they are accessories of the *plus of humanity,* become the major part of the exercise of all these faculties; in just the same way, and for the same reason, let us understand that *the affectional expression of sex-life is really the major part of the exercise of this part of the human economy!*

Such, then, is the ultimate and undeniable conclusion which we are forced to accept as a result of our studies as to "the real mission of sex in the human species."

CHAPTER IX

WHAT OUGHT TO BE DONE UNDER THESE CIRCUMSTANCES?

To answer the question which stands at the head of this chapter is no easy task, nor can a full reply be given to it at present, things being as they now are! So much must be acknowledged at the very outset. But, this much we can do: First, we can acknowledge the facts, in our own hearts and consciences at least; and then, second, we can use our best efforts to bring about conditions which will make it possible for ourselves and our fellow men and women to live lives which are in harmony with what these facts prove to be the truth in these premises! To do these two things is not only common sense, but it is a duty that every person who is loyal to life should do to the best of his or her ability.

Now, neither of these two things will be easy to do, for the most of mankind! Probably the first will be harder than the second! This will be owing to the fact that we have all so long been taught that the reverse of the conclusions reached in the last chapter is true that it will be exceedingly difficult for many of us, not to say most of us, to break away from our ancient and honorable instructions and our long-held and deeply intrenched beliefs. We are not to blame for this condition of mind, for inertia is a strong factor in the human composition. But, having recognized the truth in these matters, the manhood in our veins, and the love for humanity in our hearts should inspire us to an activity which will result in establishing rightful conditions in these essential affairs of life. And it is neither disrespect to the past, nor treason to the present to use our energies in such direction!

I say it will be no slight task for the most of the people of today to bring themselves into a mental attitude in which they will dare to admit, even to themselves, the fact that there are really *two*, nature-ordained and God-ordained, modes of sex-expression in humanity; and it will be harder still for them to acknowledge that the "affectional" manifestation of this quality is of the greater importance and potency in the up-building of human character. It is for this reason that I wish to present, just here, some suggestions which may impel to right thinking along these lines. That is, I want to formulate some of the facts and principles which ultimate in the conclusions I have just stated. To do this, let us review a little as follows:

To begin at the beginning, it seems to me that we cannot avoid acknowledging the existence and the rightful reality of the *plus of humanity!* As the proof of this has come to me, and as I have embodied it in my arguments, and so passed it on to you, I can find no escape from the conclusions it leads up to and results in! I cannot deny its presence and its forcefulness in the case of physical appetite for food, as this quality exists in myself and in mankind. My own experience, and yours as well, compel us to acknowledge such plus in ourselves; and if in us, equally so in our fellow men and women. So much seems to me absolutely certain, and I cannot see how you can help but come into the same mental condition.

That is the first step; and with so much established, ever so much more must follow as naturally as does the day the night.

For, *if* this principle holds true in the case of physical appetite, as it surely does, much more and much clearer is it a certainty in its application to eye-sight and hearing! That there is more in these senses, as they exist and are effective in mankind, than there is in them as they exist and are effective in mere animals—of this I cannot conceive that there is a shadow of doubt in any sane human mind! Furthermore, I cannot believe that any thoughtful person can help acknowledging, in all these cases of life-expression through the senses, that that which is exploited on the *plus* part of humanity is of far greater moment than that which demonstrates itself on the material plane alone. I cannot think that any reasoning and reasonable human being can possibly hold to the belief that the use of the eyes to keep one out of the ditch is of equal value in the formation of human character with the use of sight for beholding what mere animal eyes can never see! That the exercise of eye-sight on its esthetic side is of more value to mankind than is its utility on the material plane alone—of this there can be no difference of opinion among intelligent and fairminded people!

And what is true of eye-sight is equally true of hearing; you know that as well as I do.

But, with these truths established, does it necessarily follow that the principles which hold good with regard to the plus of humanity in the matters of physical appetite, and eye-sight and hearing, that these same principles will rightfully apply to sex, as this quality exists in humanity? That is the supreme question in what I am trying to get at, and I want to meet it fairly and squarely, and in such manner that there will be no more possibility of doubting the conclusions arrived at regarding it, than in the other cases upon which we have come to mutual and undeniable agreements.

Now, the truthfulness of the conclusions reached in these concerns in the cases of physical appetite and eye-sight and hearing, is all based first, on the *experiences* that have come to mankind from the exercise of these faculties on the line of the *plus of humanity.* The theory that all these faculties have a use that is of value to the *plus of humanity* has been *tried out, and it works!* Is it not safe to trust to the *experiences* of humanity in the matter of sex-expression as well, and to form conclusions based on such inductive method of arriving at the truth?

Civilized humanity has demonstrated, to the satisfaction of everybody concerned, that table furnishings and all the additions that have come to mankind at the hands of *desire and imagination* and *ingenuity,* in connection with the exploitation of physical appetite for food—that all such increments, when used sanely and under due control of the will, that is by choice and not by chance, have made for the betterment of the race, along all the lines on which it is capable of improvement. The same is true regarding eye-sight and hearing. *By the ways of using* eyes and ears, mankind has proven that they have a practical utility far and away beyond that of serving merely material needs. Is it not fair and safe to bring sex-expression and its influence upon mankind to the same kind of proof, and to form conclusions from such testimony accordingly?

Now, by their *modes of living their sex lives,* it is true, beyond a doubt, that multitudes of men and women, all over the world, in all lands, in all climes, and in all ages and times, have demonstrated, to *their* complete satisfaction, at least, that the "affectional" expression of their sex nature is not only possible, but that such manner of life has made for the development and up-building of their entire human existence, physical, mental, moral, and spiritual. To be sure, these people have been obliged, for the most part, to live as they have lived their lives in this respect, under the most unpropitious of conditions—conditions under which it was almost impossible to realize what the truth actually was. They have been taught, and practically forced to believe, that all affectional sex manifestation was not only wrong, but that it was degrading and debasing, if not a positive sin. And these teachings have come from those whom they were bound to respect, and to look up to with the most perfect faith and unbounded reverence, if not with awe and fear!

And yet, in spite of all these hindrances, handicaps, forbiddings, condemnations and threatenings, the universal manner of living among married men and women, in all times and everywhere, has been contrary to what they have been taught and to what they were supposed to believe!

And the wonderful fact about all this is, that, where husbands and wives have mutually agreed in these matters, they are convinced, in spite of all these drawbacks, of the real rightfulness and righteousness of their manner of living! They *know, by their own experiences,* that the affectional expression of sex-life has made for their well-being in more ways than they can number. Under these conditions, in view of the fact that such manner of life has *persisted* in spite of all that has been done to make it impossible, and, further, that it has been maintained by the best men and women in all the world, all the time, (the fathers and mothers are the people who have so lived), I say, is it not tremendously significant, must there not be an undeniable meaning to these things? Do not the *experiences* of these sane and wholesome men and women mean something that is of genuine importance to mankind? It would certainly seem so to every one who is capable of right thinking.

Oh, to be sure, there are multitudes of men and women, husbands and wives (especially wives),.who have not agreed in these affairs. But these are they (they are mostly wives) whose deep-seated beliefs, which have resulted from their early and often-repeated instructions in these affairs, have led them to attempt to make their manner of living conform to what they have been taught. They really look upon the whole subject as taboo, and wish that this part of their natures might be totally destroyed, never to be resurrected. Among these, reproduction is held to be the sole purpose of sex, and any other form of its expression is sin. And there are many such. The question is, whether or not they, or those who hold an opposite view, are correct?

It almost goes without saying that married people who hold to such limited beliefs, and who attempt to put them into practice, are nowhere nearly as happy in the married relation as those of the other class I have mentioned. They are much fuller of trouble, their dispositions are far less sweet, and life has far less joy for them, in multitudes of ways. As a rule, their health is not so good (in many cases this factor is *very* pronounced) and their lives are, on an average, shorter than those of happily married people. All these things are true of both the husbands and the wives whom man only, and not God at all, has joined together! Statistics may not be procurable to prove this, but what we all know of our own knowledge, *does* prove it, beyond peradventure. I shall have readers of both these classes, who can verify my statements by their own experiences!

For myself, I have been making personal observations and studies along this special line for nearly half a century, and the conclusions I have just stated are based on what I have discovered in these investigations. In pursuing this work, I have been aided by the voluntary assistance of a large number of good men and women, husbands and wives, who have freely and honestly disclosed to me their most intimate experiences in these vital affairs of their lives, and to them all, both you and I are greatly indebted for knowledge that could have been secured in no other way. They are pioneers in this great cause;

and like all those who form the front rank of progress, they have been willing to sacrifice something, yes, ever so much, for the sake of those who are to follow along the trail they have blazed through a jungle and an unknown way! I want to thank all these, right here, for their bravery and their self-sacrifice. For it is no easy matter to let any other human being into the most secret and the most sacred of the experiences of life. Think how it would be in your own case, and then you will appreciate my tribute to these whom you will never know personally, but to whom we are all indebted beyond the possibility of value-received payment!

And, added to what testimony I have gathered at the hands of these good people, I have been further assisted in my researches as I have previously noted, by a large number of physicians, clergymen, and lawyers, the three classes of professional men and women who know more of these special human experiences than any other, since they are oftenest consulted in these intimate affairs of human life and living; and all that I have gathered from all these sources (and the amount is voluminous) confirms the conclusions which I have arrived at from my own personal observations. All this testimony goes to show that sex-expression in the human species has *two* rightful modes of utilization, namely, the reproductive and the affectional, and that the exercise of both of these tends, positively, to the best interests and well-being of the parties concerned. So much for the argument on the line of experience.

Again (for the case I am presenting is so entrenched in the minds of the average reader, that is, the public, that its ancient stronghold will not yield to any single assault) what I said in an early chapter about "*desire, imagination* and *ingenuity*," is of special application on this point. Amongst all normal husbands and wives, those whose natures have not been warped and changed by wrong teachings, the *desire* for sex-expression other than for reproductive purposes alone, is practically universal! I base this statement on conclusions I have reached from testimony that I have gathered by my own investigations, and that which I have received from these professional classes I have recently mentioned. The great bulk of all such testimony makes for such conclusions, beyond peradventure.

To cover the whole case, exceptions must be noted, and I therefore add that there are a number of *wives* in whom such *desire* is at a very low ebb, and sometimes it appears to be entirely wanting; but a study of these cases has gone to prove that such condition, when it exists, is one of sophistication and abnormality; and the probabilities are many to one that it is caused by wrong teaching in youth, rather than from innate nature. The cases are very rare where there are exceptions to this rule, when all the facts are known. Such a condition among women is known among physicians as "anaesthetic," and it is claimed by those best posted in this particular, that practically all modern wives among those who are counted as of "the better classes" are subject, to a greater or less degree, to this state of body or of mind. But all the probabilities are that this state of being is more of a mental than it is of a physical condition, though the whole matter is so complicated that it is quite frequently next to an impossibility to determine its real basis of action, or lack of action, in any particular case.

It is for these reasons that, in determining what the normal *desires* of wives really are, the negative testimony of the class just mentioned is of small value in obtaining a correct conclusion, since the probabilities are that such condition is, as I have already said, a sophisticated and not a natural one. We all know the tremendous influence that early teachings have upon the formation of persistent ways of thinking, believing and acting in later life. And we are all equally aware of the fact that all the teaching that is given to children along these lines, especially to girls, where any at all is given, is of the inhibitive or annulling sort! If any little girl, yielding to her natural childish impulses, pets or fondles a little boy playmate, the finger of every adult female who witnesses such act is pointed in scorn at the child, and the words, "shamie! shamie!" are invariably hissed at the really innocent offender!

This is only one of many similar acts on the part of grown up people that tend to warp, distort and thwart the natural conditions and developments of modern adolescent and adult feminine human beings, especially in so-called Christian lands. Added to these abnormal suggestions and instructions are, in many cases, the prudish and Puritanical influences that emanate from Female Colleges, seminaries, etc., many of which are presided over by women who, either by nature or training, are anaesthetic, or at least profess to be so, and who, in any event, teach accordingly. As a matter of fact, the conditions under which girls and young women live, where thus segregated in such schools, is abnormal, and wholly contrary to the natural order of sane and wholesome development and living.

Again: The undue strain and stress of intense mental application to which so many of the young women of this age are subjected, have a tendency to extinguish and kill out the natural and normal impulses and desires of those who are subjected to such manner of life. To the prudish and Puritanical, such extinction is counted as of great merit; when, as a matter of fact, it is the very reverse of this! It is a generally recognized fact among physicians that, in many cases, such training results in nervous disturbances on the part of the victims of such methods of intellectual intensification, which manifest themselves in a multitude of ways. This is not infrequently shown in the cases of these women who marry, who, as a rule, bear few children, and, with rare exceptions, are unable to nurse their babies from their own breasts. That such results should be counted as worthy and desirable is almost beyond belief; and yet they are generally so esteemed amongst those who are reckoned as constituting "the better classes." But, when considered, or measured, by the standard of righteousness, such results are not only abnormal, but they are an abomination in the sight of all that is natural and as it should be. Such views of what is right in these premises are the product of narrow and dogmatic conceptions of the human body, and its normal functionings on the part of those whose whole programme of ethics is negative—a mere series of antis, and don'ts and Thou shalt nots!

It is not at all pleasant to write it so, but the fact is that such conditions and teachings obtain, in large degree, among the church-taught peoples. If only these same people would follow the instructions of the Book they so much revere (and of right they revere it) in which it is written "But now hath God set the members, *every one of them* in the body, as it hath pleased him," they would come much nearer correct living, both in theory and in practice, than now they do!

Truth to tell, the enlightened soul of today has come to realize that asceticism, especially when carried to an extreme, does not result in the highest form of individual character. And, not to give this part of the present study too much of a religious trend, it is only fair to say that this principle of the wholesome use of bodily functions and endowments, rather than their annihilation and extinction, is in harmony with the teachings of Jesus Christ, of whom it is written that "He came both eating and drinking"; and that he was temperate in all things, and neither greedy nor totally inhibitive in any case is a matter of history. The ascetics of ancient days are no longer counted as the greatest among men and women; and the fact that negation alone never led to human progress and positive results is universally acknowledged by all sane-thinking people. Use and not abuse is the constant law of right living and of wholesome growth for all the sons and daughters of men; and the principle applies to all the qualities and faculties which go to make up the totality of human belongings.

In these days when the idea of democracy is so universally in evidence and plead for, it is only in point to note that the human body is a democracy and not a monarchy, and that the world should be made safe for it, as such! The fact is that every composite whole which is made up of a number of different parts, each one of which contributes to the efficiency of the complete organization, is a democracy. And in every well-ordered composite organism each part has its rightful place and its right to function according to the relative position it holds as regards the total whole. Under these conditions, it is not right that any one part of any such organism should set itself up as superior to all the rest, and should try to rule them all, and make them all subject to its authority. And this is specially true of the democracy of the human body! In such democracy, it ill becomes the belly, for instance, to set itself up as the ruler of all the rest of the human make-up, and to insist that all besides itself should minister solely to its desires for meat and drink. Nor should sex be permitted to lord it ruthlessly over the fellow-members among whom it is only one. On the other hand, it is by no means in harmony with this idea of the democracy of the body that the brain, or the soul, if you will, should set itself up as the monarch of all it surveys, and try to put into slavery to its dictates any or all other bodily functions or powers! Much less should it be permitted to annihilate or to exterminate any God-given quality in the body *all of whose members* He hath set therein "*as it hath pleased Him*," to refer again to the quotation from the Bible which I made a few paragraphs back. Indeed, to try to destroy and make of none effect any quality or faculty which God has placed in the body and whose rightful functioning experience has proved is essential to the well-being of the body itself and of the soul which dwells therein—to do this, or attempt to do this, is "meddling with nature's ways" in a manner which is a sin of the first magnitude, and an abomination in the sight of gods and men! Let those who have so officiously, not to say piously, dogmatized by the use of the words I have just quoted, and which I have noted in a previous chapter, consider the righteousness of their teachings in view of this fact!

With these points established, namely, that all the organs and properties which the life-force has produced should be used according to their original intent and purpose, both in all the lower and higher forms of life, mankind included; and the further conclusion that all the properties which man possesses in common with the orders of life below him, have, of right, a double form of expression, namely a material and a super-material form, to say it in that way; and having shown that all these conditions are God-ordained, we are now ready to declare that sex in the human family is no exception to this rule, but that it also has a rightful place in the human economy, and that it has two rightful modes of expression, namely, the reproductive and the affectional, and that the exercise of both of these under the control of the will and as a matter of choice and not of chance is a natural and a wholesome manner of living which tends to the growth and development of normal human beings! But, having come so far, we are brought face to face with the problem of how such righteous practice, especially in the married relation of men and women, can be realized.

In reply to this supreme question of the present discussion, the first item to be emphasized is one already stated, namely, that both these forms of sex-expression must be made to come entirely under the control of the will; that they should always be matters of choice and not of chance; and that they should never be consummated without the mutual consent of both parties concerned. So much seems certain. The question still remains, how such manner of living can be brought about. Let us consider the reproductive factor in the problem first.

In approaching this phase of the issue, namely, that of making the begetting of children a matter of choice and not of chance, it is well to call the attention of the reader to the status of the present order of things, in this regard, the basic facts of which are now as follows:

As things now are, not only is chance a supreme factor in the bringing of children into the world, but such condition is made practically imperative and permanent by the enforcement of a state of ignorance in the premises, which is buttressed by laws which make it virtually impossible to escape from such a way of living! As the laws of the United States now stand on its statute books, it is a crime, punishable by both fine and imprisonment, for any human being to impart to any other human being, any knowledge whatsoever, which will result in making the begetting of children a matter of choice rather than of chance. A condition which can but result in the maintenance of ignorance in this matter which is of such vital importance. This fact may not be generally known by the rank and file of the people who are subject to such legal requirements, but that the law is as here stated, is certainly true. It goes without saying, under these circumstances, that nothing can be done to remedy present conditions until these laws are repealed! I shall discuss in a later chapter the many and various reasons for the repeal of such laws; enough to say, at this point in my argument, that they must be removed from our statute books before any progress can be made in the matter of begetting children by the fathers and mothers in this great land of ours.

With the repeal of such laws, the whole subject of conception in the human species should be made a matter of scientific study and investigation by the ablest, the most learned and expert men and women along these lines that the world contains; and the pursuit of such quest should not be abandoned until the positive and definite knowledge is attained regarding the entirety of the issue in hand. That is, definite, practical and absolutely reliable means for the wilful control of conception in the human family should be sought and found, and when thus obtained, such knowledge should be disseminated amongst all classes of men and women who are now endowed with the right and privilege of bringing children into this world!

Now, I am well aware that this is a radical statement to make, under present conditions; and I ask my readers to suspend judgment upon it for the present, and to hear me through, before forming a final opinion as to its truth or falsity. All I care to say about it just here is, that, in any event, it is the first move to make to bring about the possibility of bringing children into this world by choice rather than by chance, and that is the main issue under consideration in this treatise.

As to just how such knowledge may be obtained, that is beyond the scope of this discussion. That is a matter for experts to work out. But this thing is true, namely, that the *desire* of millions of men and women goes out for the possession of such knowledge; their *imagination* regards its attainment as a possibility, and it only remains for the *ingenuity* of wise men and women who are naturally endowed with special ability to search out and find such knowledge, to attain the desired result. It is practically a similar problem to that presented by the presence of diphtheria and yellow fever in the world. These diseases existed for ages, and the question was, how to be rid of them. The *desires* of mankind demanded their extermination; their *imaginations* conceived it possible that they should be overcome; and the *ingenuity* of experts resulted in their mastery. In a similar manner the mastery of sex-expression, on its reproductive side, will one day be secured, and then the begetting of children will be a matter of choice and not of chance as it now is, but not before.

Such a means for securing this result must be simple, effective, and harmless to the parties who utilize it. To find such may be no easy task, most certainly it will not be; but the difficulties that confront its discovery are by no means insurmountable when seriously attacked by the genius of the great men who will some day undoubtedly undertake its finding-out. Many a life was sacrificed before the mystery of the cause of yellow fever was discovered; but what was reached for was finally found, and tropical lands where once this deadly plague was supreme, are now among the healthiest spots on all the globe! There is an analogy here that is both hopeful and comforting.

So much as to what needs to be done in order that conditions of choice and not of chance may obtain on the reproductive side of sex-expression. It remains to consider what will follow on the affectional side of such expression, these things being established.

And here, let it again be urged that such expression has a rightful place in the economy of normal sex-living. I have already set this fact forth somewhat elaborately; but because of the wide-extended and generally-held opinions, or teachings, to the contrary, I here add some further proofs of its truthfulness, as follows:

And here, probably the supreme item that counts in favor of such an order of living is the fact that the universal normal desire of the human kind goes out in this direction. All normal men and women long for such expression of one of the most potent factors in all their beings. More than this, the experiences of millions of the highest types of the human race which have ever lived have proven, beyond all doubt, that such manner of life is not only possible, but that it tends to their highest development in all the departments of their being. And not only is this true, but it has further been amply demonstrated that the lack of such affectional expression tends to debilitate and weaken, and throw out of balance whole multitudes of men and women who are thus deprived of an essential element in their growth and development. This is another fact that is perhaps not capable of statistical proof, but it is one which is well known by all who have made careful and correct investigations along these lines; and is of far more significance than is generally accorded by the rank and file, who have long been kept in ignorance of the real facts in the premises. However, these same members of the rank and file are, very many of them, really aware of the situation, especially as it pertains to themselves, only they do not say so!

So true is this which I have just stated that a leading expert in these matters, a man of cool judgment and wide experience in the study of such cases, has said that the suppression, or the attempted suppression, of the sex-impulse, on the affectional side, is the cause of more suffering and woe in the human family than is excess in the same part of the make-up of mankind! As some one has truly said, "suppression is always dangerous; when windows are always kept shut, the house soon grows sour and moldy." Not only is this a sane general principle, but it is especially in point in the case of sex-expression on the affectional side. I am well aware that "one swallow does not make a summer," nor will a single instance prove the point I am now presenting; nevertheless "straws show which way the current flows," and here is a straw that came floating on this particular stream and claimed my attention as I was writing this morning, as follows: I quote a few lines from a letter which came to my desk just now, the same being written by a woman who is suffering from an enforced inability to express herself on the affectional side of her sex-nature. She is not an abnormal woman, not from a low class of life. On the contrary, she is descended from a long line of Puritan ancestry, and is herself one of the best educated and most companionable women along all the best and highest interests in life, I have ever known. And yet she writes: "Every day I am doing battle with my nerves, which are still badly upset because of my insistent longing for what I cannot have, namely, the satisfaction of the affectional side of my sex-nature. I get days, or parts of days, without torment, but the main issue is constantly with me, in greater or less degree. My nervousness has developed into muscular contractions which are a torture to me that is extremely painful. These are as automatic as the beating of my heart, and the only way I can control them is to play 'dead dog,' all over, including my mind. I still want what I need as much as ever, and it is a continual and wearing task to exist without it." If this woman were a hypochondriac, or a degenerate, what she so honestly says would not have much significance; but she is none of these, as I have already said. Nor is her case an isolated one, as multitudes of her sisters, all over the civilized world, could testify if they dared to tell the truth regarding themselves in this part of their being. And it is because of this wide-spread condition amongst women, and much more so among men, that the issue I am now considering is so important, and demands the attention and helpfulness which the situation calls for. It is for this reason that I am writing as I am.

Not only is it true that untold suffering is caused by this untoward condition of affairs, but it is equally true that such suppression of a natural function of the human body, mind and soul, has resulted in numerous and greatly-to-be-regretted sexual aberrations on the part of large numbers of men and women. To name and describe these is beyond the scope of this book, but they are well known to all who are posted in the science of right living, and volumes have been written which deal with these phenomena. Such volumes contain the record of tragedies of the deepest dye, and are pathetic and sorrowful to the limit of human possibility to endure suffering. That wholesome and righteous relief should be obtained for these afflicted bodies and souls is a truth that needs no argument to establish. And that such relief could be obtained if the science of conception in the human family were mastered and made subject to choice and not to chance, and such definite knowledge were universally disseminated, is a self-demonstrating proposition. Add to this an intelligent knowledge and practice of "The Art of Love" among husbands and wives, and the problem I am discussing would be successfully solved, beyond peradventure. However, to make such assertion is one thing, and to establish it by undeniable proofs is another thing. And to so establish it will be the work of future chapters.

CHAPTER X

THE PROS AND CONS OF THE ISSUES INVOLVED IN THE POSITION JUST TAKEN

THE first and most essential point to be determined in settling the issue immediately in hand is to make sure of what is absolutely right in the premises, that is, to find out what the true law of life and of life progress, in this part of the being and make-up of normal men and women, is. And in order to do this successfully, for men and women as they go, it will be necessary to call the attention of the reader to certain fundamental facts which must be brought into evidence just here; the first of which is the radical difference that exists between what is called morality and what is really right! Or, to phrase the matter in another way, the first item in this count is to point out the difference between morality and righteousness. To the consideration of this difference, the following paragraphs are herewith submitted:

The essential difference between the ultimate significance of these words is readily seen when their derivation is noted, as follows: The word, morals, is derived from the Latin word *mores*, which primarily means custom, or habit. That is, according to its original meaning, a moral act was one that was customary, or habitual; or, to put it into more modern phrase, it was something that everybody did; and to this meaning, there was eventually added the idea that these things that everybody did should be of such nature that nobody should disapprove of the same. That is, a moral act is one which a person can do and not have the neighbors find fault with its doing and its doer! As to whether such act is really right or wrong, when brought to the test of how it really affects the doer in body, mind or estate, this element enters not a whit into the question of its morality. In a word, morality is simply an arbitrary code of life and of living which has become established by custom, and which has, by sheer persistence of its long being what it is, become fixed or "proper" in the eyes of supposedly good people. That is, morality is "the proper thing" and immorality is what is counted the reverse of this.

And now, because of this fact, and because, accidentally, as it were, here and there some acts have met with approval and some have met an opposite fate, and because the world is large and its people are numerous, and because, under primitive conditions, these different people had little knowledge of each other and each other's doings—for all these reasons, it came about that moralities differed in different localities and among different peoples, so that what was considered moral in one place would be counted immoral in another place, and *vice versa.* The result of this is that morality is really a matter of locality, or of geography, if you will, as a moment's consideration will readily prove. Let a few instances in point be noted, just here:

In ancient Sparta, it was a moral act to expose imperfectly formed babies to the vultures who ate them up! In modern United States we organize societies to take special care of such children. In some sections of India, to this day, it is a moral act to burn a widow on the funeral pyre of her deceased husband; but the English who now rule that land, declare such act immoral, and are doing all in their power to exterminate such practice. In many localities dancing is counted as immoral, and theater-going and card-playing are included in the same list of things that should not be done by moral people. When I was a boy, if a woman should have ridden through the streets of our little country town "cross-saddle" she would have been counted an immoral woman, and have been banished, unanimously, from the "good society" of that locality. Now a side-saddle is a "back number," and our women ride horses astride, and our girls are perfectly at home on bicycles. No one now thinks of calling such immoral!

But I need not protract these illustrations. We can all call to mind similar cases without number, and every such case is only another proof of my original contention, namely, that morality is almost entirely a matter of geography.

Again: The derivation of the word righteousness shows its essential import and its real significance. This word comes to us from the Anglo Saxon word, "recht," which means straight, that is, that which always goes in one and the same direction, and in which there is "no variableness, neither shadow of turning," to use a forceful phrase which has an excellent origin.

Now, measured by the standard of righcousness, any act must stand or fall by the way in which it tallies with the eternal and never-varying laws that pertain to the manner of doing, and the results which follow the doing, of such act. The item as to whether onlookers approve of such act has nothing to do with the case, so far as its being as it should be is concerned. If it accords with the eternal laws that apply in the premises, and results in correct and wholesome outcomes, that is all that is required; and this test is what determines the real status of any act, as right or wrong!

Under these conditions, it is clearly evident, without further argument, that there may be a great difference between what are counted moral acts and what are really righteous acts! A moral act *may* be really unrighteous, and a really righteous act may be counted immoral, and *vice versa.* But before God there can be but one standard of measurement for any and all human acts, and that is the standard of righteousness and not of morality. Think seriously of this, for it has an immense significance in the matter we are considering.

Looking still further into the matter of righteousness as it stands related to human actions, note this, namely, that the rightness or wrongness of any such act, judged by its results, must be determined by the effect such act produces upon the object upon which it "lands," so to speak; and note further that the results of any human act can only "land" in one or both of two places, namely, upon the individual himself or upon some one, or something other than himself. That is, everything you or I can do will either affect us alone, or some one or something other than ourselves, or all of us together. All of which means that the righteousness of any human act, judged by its results, must be looked for in the effect it produces upon that upon which it acts. If such result makes for the betterment of that upon which it acts, the act is good, or righteous. If it makes for the harm or undoing of what it acts upon, the act is bad or unrighteous. And, in either case, neither custom nor what the neighbors think, has anything to do with the real righteousness of what is done, one way or another! These are fundamental principles which should always be kept in mind when determining the rightness or the wrongness of any human act.

Especially is this true in the case of the human acts I shall call the attention of the reader to before we are through with this chapter.

Just to get the reader into the way of judging human actions by this standard of measurement, let us take a few acts that I have previously spoken about, and see how they will tally under such treatment. For instance, take as simple an example as that of the manner in which it is righteous or unrighteous for a woman to ride a horse! There are two ways in which the manner of riding may result, namely, its effect upon the woman and upon the horse. If either of these is harmed by the way in which the riding is done, such act is unrighteous, or bad. If one or both are benefited the act is righteous, or good. In either case, what the neighbors think about it, or how the act is regarded by custom or by "good society," has nothing to do with the case. And all the other human acts I have noted in this chapter, and all that you or any can think of, can be rightly judged of, and their rightness or wrongness determined correctly by this rule.

Note further, that the ultimate rightness or wrongness of any act cannot be determined by any outside "authority," that is by what some person, or any number of persons, more or less, may say about it. Nothing is right, nor can be made right, simply because some authority declares it to be so, and it makes little difference, in the final round-up, what such alleged "authority" may be, whether it is some single individual who is hedged about by pomp and circumstance, or is a mass of humanity, as represented by some "law-making body," or a "referendum" which includes all the people in the world! No one of these, nor all of them together, can make that right which is essentially wrong, or *vice versa!* Only those acts are right or wrong which, both as to cause and effect, are grounded in the ultimate laws that pertain to their doing. Or, if you may choose to say it so, (and I have no objection to your saying it so) only that is right which The Maker of All Things, the Eternal First Cause of Everything, has made to be right! The only thing to be careful about, if the proposition is put in this way, is to be *very* sure as to just what the Maker of All Things has made to be right, before passing upon any given act! In all ages there have been those who have, of their own liking, put a "thus saith the Lord" before words which really had nothing behind them but the voice of the human being who uttered them! Well is it said in the Book: "Prove all things! Hold fast to that which is good," and Jesus never said a better thing than: "Why, even of yourselves, judge ye not what is right?" That is, to clinch my argument just here, it behooves all of us, and everybody, to get down to, and find out, the eternally correct order of things, as originally determined, when we undertake to settle the rightness or wrongness, the righteousness or the unrighteousness of any human act! To prove the correctness or the incorrectness of this theory, it might be well for the reader to try out some of his or her own acts, when judged by this rule. Ask yourself the question, and answer it truthfully: Does this act of mine originate in a correctly-grounded law of my being, or is it only an expression of what I want, regardless of anything but my own desire; and does the effect that it produces result in the betterment or the harm of myself, or of any other individual or thing upon which it "lands"? Try out a few of your own acts by this rule, and see how you come out, and then you will be in good shape to pass judgment upon the special conclusions that I shall come to before this chapter is done.

But before you do this, let me make one more suggestion which will help you to render just judgment in what you are about to decide upon, as follows:

I have said that the result of any human act can only "land" on one or both of two objectives, namely, yourself, or some person or thing other than yourself. Now add to this, that such result can only express itself for good or ill in the effect it produces upon the *physical*, the *mental* or the *spiritual* make-up of the individual it lands upon! All that makes up yourself or any other being is composed of one or all of these three elements, body, mind and spirit. These three things make up all there is of anybody, and the only way in which anybody can be affected, in any way, must be through one or more of these parts of one's being. Some acts of ours will only affect the *physical* part of human beings. The instance I have cited as to the manner in which a woman should ride a horse is such a case, where only the material quality of the rider is involved. The only question to be considered in this case, so far as the woman is concerned, is, what manner of riding best suits the physical comfort and well-being of the rider? And a similar question might rightly be asked regarding the horse, but that need not be considered here.

But there are other acts of ours that go far beyond the mere physical part of a human being's make-up, and involve not only the mental, but also the spiritual well- or ill-being of such. The use of spirituous liquors might serve as a somewhat crude illustration on this point, as it is a well-established fact that such use, especially when carried to the extreme of drunkenness, does affect the physical, the mental and the spiritual status of the user. Here, no ghost need come from the grave to tell us that the use of alcohol, at least when carried to such excess, does result in the harm of the user in all three of these qualities of his nature. In judging, then, of the righteousness or unrighteousness of getting drunk, the issue is settled as unrighteous, because it harms the individual who indulges in such act, in his physical, his mental and his spiritual being. The issue as to the morality or immorality of getting drunk, that is, of the custom itself, or of what people think about it, cuts no figure in the case at all. The sole point to be considered is how it affects the individual upon whom such act "lands."

All this is undeniably true, and the principles it involves are equally forceful in judging the rightness or the wrongness of any and all human acts. In a word, it is not the morality of such acts, that is, what is customary, or what people think about them which is the final arbiter in such cases; but how the physical, the mental or the spiritual condition of the party, or parties, concerned, one or all, are affected thereby. I repeat, for emphasis, that in no other way than in one or all of these three, can any act or acts of any one human being, or of any number of human beings, affect any one or all of mankind! These principles are of universal application in testing the righteousness or the unrighteousness of all the acts of all the sons and daughters of men, in all times and in all places, upon the face of the earth. Keep these principles in mind, in addition to the ones I first laid down, when you are judging the rightness or the wrongness of your own acts or those of your neighbors! And remember, too, that the force of the Golden Rule comes in just here, namely, that you do unto others (especially in the affairs we are now considering) as you would have others do unto you. Now judge a few of your own acts by these principles! And when you have done this, do not forget to keep *all* these principles in mind, when you come to judge the conclusions I shall finally come to in what I am writing!

Having thus laid what seems to me a broad and deep and sure foundation for the particular structure I purpose to erect upon it, let us proceed to build that structure as follows:

The "Pros and Cons" to be considered in this chapter relate especially and specifically to the rightness or wrongness of the two ways of sex-expression in the human family. These two modes of expression are, as I have said many times, first, that of reproduction, which mankind holds in common with all other life-forms; and, second, that of "affectional" sex-expression, which the forms of life below him know nothing about. That these two forms of sex-expression exist in the human family we all know. The questions to be settled regarding one or both of them is the rightness or the wrongness of such expression, and in answering such questions my purpose is to prove the case, or cases, one way or the other, by the application of the rule that I have just laid down for determining the righteousness or unrighteousness of human actions. Let us first address ourselves to the reproductive form of sex-expression:

And in order to deal fairly with this question, it is necessary first, to have a comprehensive knowledge of just how it is that the reproduction of life-forms is brought about. It would seem that such knowledge ought to be a universal possession, at this time in the world's history; but, as a matter of fact, it is an item of almost universal ignorance, especially as it pertains to the human family! And such ignorance is especially pronounced among "the female of the species," married and unmarried, (especially the latter) because it is not considered "wise" nor "proper" for these to know about such things! Especially is it held that these latter, unmarried females, should be kept "innocent" along these lines. To call things by their right names, these young people are kept IGNORANT, instead of innocent, a condition that has resulted in untold harm, all through the ages, to the parties who have been the victims of such an untoward state, of these essential affairs that pertain to human life. And it can be said, with equal truthfulness, that comparatively few *men*, married or unmarried, have any definite knowledge regarding the reproduction of life-forms, and their IGNORANCE is especially dense as it applies to the human species.

No one, not even the wisest, knows *all* about these things; but there is enough known to make the possession of such knowledge of value to every intelligent human being. It is knowledge of this sort that I shall proceed to consider. It is for this reason, namely, the IGNORANCE of humanity along these lines, that I am compelled to stop, right here, and explain these things, if I am to get any results that are worth while from the readers of this book, take them by and large. And it is for the "by and large" that I am writing! Did not Jesus say well when he said: "I come not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance"? Those who know all about these things need not read what I am writing; but the list of such is so small as to be almost a negligible item on this count!

Here, then, is a statement of the essential facts regarding the reproduction of life-forms in this world:

All life-forms are composed of cells which make up the material bodies of what is thus built up. These cells, when complete, consist of two parts, a positive and a negative, and both of these must be present in order that the cell may be effective and do the work which it exists to perform. If either of these elements, the positive or the negative, is lacking, the cell is practically dead; anyhow, it is incapable of producing any results whatsoever! Such a cell, or a cell in this condition, is spoken of as "infertile." But, given these two elements, the cells increase and multiply, and cause more like themselves to be, and it is by means of such increase of cell-multiplications that all life-forms grow and become what they are.

Now, there is an old, a *very* old Latin phrase (for the ultimate fact in this matter has been known for a long time. The only trouble is, that it has been known to a *very few*, and that such knowledge has been systematically kept from the *very many*, for ages and ages.) which reads, *omne vivum ex ovo,* which, in plain English means: Every living thing comes from an egg; which is only another way of saying that every living thing comes from a *cell*. For an egg, any egg, is nothing but a cell! Of course, we all know that there are infinite varieties of eggs, so far as their forms are concerned; but all eggs are alike in one respect, namely, that they each contain a *single* cell, or half of a complete single cell, to be exact, which, in itself, possesses only *one* of the elements which goes to make up a productive cell, which can cause more cells to be. Such original cell in an egg as it is at first produced, may be considered a positive or a negative, but it is only one of these, and so long as it remains just this, and nothing more, it is practically lifeless, and wholly inefficient so far as producing any further life-forms is concerned.

On the other hand, for every egg that is produced in this single cell form, there is provided a mate, as it were; that is, a positive for its negative, or a negative for its positive, so to speak; and it is by a union of these two elements, one of which exists originally within the egg, and the other of which has its being outside the egg, that the egg-cell is made efficient and able to do what it had no ability to do before such union was effected. This union of these two elements which are essential to the efficiency of an egg, is called fertilization; and every egg must be fertilized by merging into itself an opposite, something which comes from its proper mate, before it can become efficient for life's uses. But, once fertilized, every egg possesses the possibility of causing more to be, of the same kind as that which produced itself. This is a very simple statement of what takes place in all reproduction of life-forms, of every sort and description.

Now there are some life-forms which possess, in a single body, the power of producing both the positive and the negative elements of cells; that is, they can produce eggs and that which fertilizes eggs, all from the same body; but, even in these, such positives and negatives are produced apart from each other to start with, and their union takes place farther along in their mutually separate existence. In other cases, the single-celled egg is produced in one life-form and its fertilizing mate is produced in another life-form, and these two elements, thus produced apart, must be united before fertilization can take place. Many flowers are fine illustrations of the first of these, though all flowers are not built on this plan. An apple blossom is of the sort in which both these qualities are contained in a single life-form. At the base of each apple blossom there is a little pocket, so to say, in which there is produced a tiny apple-egg waiting to be fertilized and so to bring about the growth of an apple and apple-seeds from which more apple-trees and apples may come in turn. Up from this little apple-pocket, there grows a small tube, which extends as far as the top of the apple blossom and which is capped, or topped, by a little mouth, or wider opening into the tube which leads to the egg-pocket. All around this tube there stand little projections from the center of the blossom which bear the vitalizing material which the apple-egg needs for its fertilization. This material is like a very fine powder, or dust, and is called pollen. It is composed of an almost infinite number of little pollen grains, any *one* of which will fertilize the apple-egg, if it can come into proper contact with it. To make such proper contact between the apple-egg and the apple-pollen, a number of grains of the fertilizing dust fall into the mouth which caps the egg-tube, and pass down that tube into the pocket where lies the apple-egg, waiting to be fertilized. Some *one* of these many pollen grains unites with the egg-cell, and all the rest which have come down the tube, any and all of which were able and ready to cause such fertilization, perish and count for nothing, so far as realizing their original purpose is concerned! Besides this, an infinite number of the pollen grains which are produced by the apple blossom, never succeed in reaching the egg-tube at all, but fall to the ground, an ineffective surplus, which is of no value whatsoever, so far as their real efficiency is concerned. It is in this way that *millions* of pollen grains perish to where a single *one* is effective, a condition of things which is known as the "prodigality of nature," and which seems to be necessary in order that the fertilization of apple-eggs may be made certain. That is, the proportion of fertilizing grains of apple-pollen to the number of apple-eggs to be fertilized, is an infinite number of the one, to a limited number of the other; and this is a principle that obtains in the reproduction of all life-forms, from the lowest to the highest. Keep this particular point in mind for use later in this talk!

What I have just described tells what happens when both the egg and its fertilizer are produced in one and the same individual life-form. There is another condition in which the egg is produced by one life-form and its proper fertilizer in another life-form of a similar nature, but which functions in a different way so far as reproduction is concerned. Some varieties of strawberries are of this sort. In some kinds of strawberries, the eggs are borne on one plant and the fertilizing substance on another. In such cases, both kinds of plants must be set in the same strawberry bed, or there will be no fruit! It is because of failure to do this, that some people who try to raise strawberries fail in their attempt. But here is the wonderful thing in this case, that the pollen from the fertilizing plants will travel several feet through the air to meet and fertilize the blossoms of the egg-bearing plants! Such a bed may be set with three or four rows of egg-bearing plants, to one row of pollen-bearing plants, and still the egg-bearing blossoms will be fertilized by the pollen that blows over from the one row to the three or four. But this shows what a lot of pollen must be produced in order that, subject to such waste by having to travel through the air, the fertilization of the egg-bearing blossom may be made certain. As a matter of fact, so much pollen is produced by the pollen-bearing plants that a perfect shower of this fertilizing material is blown across, from row to row when plants are thus set. And I am telling this to emphasize the fact of the "prodigality of nature" in producing such a great amount of fertilizing material in proportion to the eggs to be fertilized, for this is an item which will prove to be of the greatest possible moment in a conclusion we are headed for, and which we shall arrive at in due time. Don't forget this!

Corn presents another most interesting variety of fertilization. Here, the corn-eggs are located on the cob, every kernel being such an egg, or cell, and all are surrounded by the covering of the husk. From each of these cells, or primary kernels, an egg-tube grows and passes up inside the husk till it reaches clear outside this sheath. These egg-tubes are called "corn-silk" and everybody knows about them as such. But here is what comparatively few people do know, namely, that every one of these threads of corn-silk is a hollow tube, where it protrudes into the air; and every one of these tubes has a little mouth at its outer end, waiting to catch and carry into the tubes the fertilizing pollen, which the corn-egg is waiting for down below. This fertilizing tube is just like that of an apple blossom, only it is much longer.

On a corn plant, the pollen-bearing blossom is at the very top of the stalk, and so is located several feet from the "ears" where the corn-eggs are borne. These pollen-bearing blossoms grow on the "corn tassel," and they bear pollen just at the time that the "corn-silk" thrusts itself outside the husk. They produce untold numbers of pollen-grains, which fall in a perfect shower upon all below them, covering the corn-leaves, and even the ground, with a yellow powder which is nothing more than the surplus of fertilizing material gone to waste! Of course, out of such an infinite supply of fertilizing germs falling all about, it is an easy matter for the little mouths, at the tops of the corn-silks, to catch what they are waiting for; and, once caught, what they catch travels the full length of the silk-tubes and fertilizes the corn-eggs below. Isn't this wonderful beyond all telling? And note, once more, the almost infinite surplus of pollen-germs that are produced in comparison with the very few which are really utilized for actual fertilization. Something of how great this surplus is, any one who has walked through a corn-field when the corn-tassels were in bloom, and had his or her clothing covered with the yellow dust, can realize. And remember, too, that each pollen-grain is so small that several of them could easily stand on the point of a needle! How many of them must there be on an acre of corn? How many in all the cornfields in all the world? The proposition to estimate their number is staggering! And the great bulk of them all go to waste and never produce the fertilization they were made to effect!

Our common red clover presents another most interesting method of fertilization, going to show the necessity of the "prodigality of nature" in this matter of producing fertilizing germs in such abundance. In this form of plant-life, the pollen has to be carried from plant to plant by the wings of bumble-bees! These bees go from flower to flower to gather the honey which these blossoms produce, and in doing this their wings become covered with the pollen-grains, which their buzzing shakes off when they touch the blossoms which need fertilization! The common honey-bee cannot effect such fertilization, because his proboscis is too short to reach the honey which is stored in a red-clover blossom, and these bees never try to gather honey from these blossoms. And so, when there are no bumble-bees, there are no clover seeds! There may be clover blossoms, but no clover seeds. And this, too, is wonderful beyond telling! There are many other plants which have to be fertilized by the help of insects, and all have to produce an unlimited supply of fertilizing material. This infinite supply of such material is the chief point I wish to call attention to in what I have so far said, and to make this item in the count still more forcible, I add a few more words regarding this same phenomenon as it applies to the eggs themselves, that is, to their super-abundance and over-supply as they primarily exist.

A simple case of surplus egg production will well illustrate what I mean. If you will think of the number of apple-blossoms, or cherry-blossoms on one of such trees, and then think of the small number of apples or cherries that come to maturity on these same trees, you will have a good idea of the "prodigality of nature" in the making of apple-eggs or cherry-eggs. Every blossom on the trees contains a primary egg which has in it the possibility of becoming fertilized, and of reproducing after its kind. But not one in hundreds, not to say thousands, in many cases, of these eggs ever become fertilized, much less ever bear fruit! The overwhelming majority of them perish in their incomplete state, and die and fall to the ground, and thus come to nothing, so far as their initial possibilities and purpose are concerned! Keep this in mind also, along with the tremendous waste of fertilizing material, to which I have previously referred. Later, I shall ask you to think of what would happen if *every* infertile egg that is produced should become fertilized, and thus cause more of its kind to be! But I'll not urge that point here and now, but will come to it in due course of time.

And let me add, just here, that I have gone into these interesting and wonderful details as I have in the hope of arousing in the minds of my readers a correct and rightful mental attitude towards the whole subject of the reproduction of life-forms in this world. To any one who sees such things aright, the whole process is so wonderful, not to say astonishing, that it inspires the most profound reverence in the mind of the beholder! In the presence of such phenomena, one feels the force of the words: "Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground." True it is that, to the great mass of men and women, who are ignorant of the facts I have recounted, the whole process of reproduction is not a matter of indifference only, but something to make sport of; and in the higher forms of life, to be counted as vulgar, not to say "nasty." And this, by many people who count themselves as virtuous to the utmost, and as educated to the most respectable degree! To many of these people, the whole subject is practically repulsive, and most certainly taboo. I want my readers to free themselves from any such untoward mental attitude, not only in regard to what I have so far written, but even to the end of the argument I am now making.

Coming up into the realm of the animal kingdom, and studying the means and methods of reproduction there, we find that the same phenomena occur here that obtain in the life-forms we have already examined. Here the old Latin phrase, "*omne vivum ex ovo*," still holds good, and it is still true that every living thing comes from an egg. And these eggs which produce animal life-forms are "infertile" at first, just as they are in the vegetable kingdom; that is, they are only the half of what can become a complete whole only by being "fertilized" by their proper mates. Some one has given us the phrase "the duality of all unity in nature," words which perfectly express the facts and conditions we are now dealing with.

Now, in all advances which the life-force makes as it manifests itself in the higher forms of its expression, some variations appear in the conditions of the materials it works with. Some of the old, or former, conditions remain, and new ones, or variations in some of the old ones, are brought into being. Accordingly, as we observe the phenomena of reproduction in the animal kingdom, we shall find that, while the essential elements are the same in both cases, yet there are differences to be noted, some of which are as follows:

So far as the *ova*, or primary eggs are concerned, they are practically the same in both the vegetable and the animal kingdoms; but there is a variation in the animal fertilizing material, which, in this realm of life-forms, takes the form of a fluid, instead of a dry powder, as in the vegetable world, as we have already seen. A change of name is also given to the animal fertilizing material, which is known as spermatazoa, instead of pollen. The word spermatazoa means something that gives life, and a most significant word it is, for it describes that whose mission it is to give life to the otherwise lifeless eggs which it is made to "fertilize." Like pollen, this fertilizing material consists of an infinite number of cells, or germs; but it differs from pollen in this respect, that, whereas, pollen-germs have no power to move themselves about on their own initiative, the spermatazoa have such ability. They are not subject to the action of winds, or tides, or bees, to effect their purpose, but have the means of reaching what they are designed to meet "under their own power," as mechanics say. To accomplish this, these life-giving germs float, or swim, as it were, in a mucous fluid which is provided for their preservation and utilization, and in which they live and move and have their being very much as fishes live in water. And as is the case with pollen, there are literally millions of these germs in a space that is almost inconceivably small. Like pollen, many of these animal life-germs, or spermatazoa, could be held on the point of a needle! This whole mass of spermatazoa and the substance in which they float, is known as "seminal fluid." And, just as the vegetable-cells are brought into contact with the pollen-grains and so are fertilized, even so the animal egg-cells are met and made "fertile" by meeting and coming in contact with the germs contained in the seminal fluid. In this particular the processes of fertilization are practically alike in the two kingdoms of life forms.

And, as is the case in the vegetable kingdom, sometimes both the egg-producing and the fertilizing-causing material are produced in one and the same material body. This is the case in many of the lower forms of animal life, the angle worm being a good illustration of this sort. In the body of each individual angle worm there are located separate organs which respectively produce angle worm eggs and the seminal fluid which can fertilize them; just as in an apple-blossom, both the apple-egg and the pollen are produced by one and the same individual apple-bloom. This condition of both eggs and that which fertilizes them originating and coming from one and the same physical body is common to many of the lower forms of animal life, as I have already said.

But, in the higher forms of animal life, the organs which produce eggs and those which produce that which fertilizes them are located in separate physical bodies, each for each. The bodies which possess the organs which produce eggs are known as female bodies, and those which have organs for producing egg-fertilization material are known as male bodies. That is, all female animals produce eggs, and all male animals produce seminal fluid; and, as is the case in plants, the fertilization of the egg can be brought about only by bringing the eggs and that which fertilizes them into contact with each other.

Now, this contact of these two life-form-producing elements, the eggs and the spermatazoa, is brought about in various ways. Generally speaking, all animal eggs are produced in the female bodies which originate them; and all seminal fluids have their source in organs which are located within the male bodies from which they come. In the case of some animals, the eggs are expelled from the body of the female which produces them, before they meet the seminal fluid and become fertilized; and with other animals, the fertilization takes place while the egg, or eggs, are still within the female body. Fishes are animals of the first-mentioned sort. The female fish expel the eggs from their bodies in shallow water, and after they are thus placed, the male fish swims above them and pours out over them a quantity of seminal fluid which mingles with the eggs and fertilizes them. It will be seen at once that there is bound to be a great waste of both eggs and of seminal fluid when fertilization is made to take place in this way; and because this is so, we again find a "prodigality of nature" in the fact that many single female fish will lay several million eggs at one "spawning," as it is called, while the number of spermatazoa that a male fish will emit for their fertilization is almost beyond computation!

When fish eggs are thus fertilized, the life-process for their growth and development begins and goes on, fostered by the action of the sun and the water; until, in due time, the eggs "hatch" and new individual fish-bodies (or babies) thus come into being. This is the wonderful story of how reproduction takes place in the order of fishes.

Again, in the case of birds and all sorts of fowls, the process of reproduction varies a little, as follows: Here, the eggs are fertilized while they are still inside the body of the female which produces them, and are then expelled from the body, or "layed," after such fertilization. Afterward they may be "hatched" by a process that everybody knows about, and so I need not tell about here. However, if such eggs are not fertilized before they are "layed," they will never hatch! And this is a fact that multitudes of people do not know! There is a reason for this that I need not stop to enlarge upon here, but which you can easily think out, if you will take the trouble to do so. I regret to say that many people who are counted as especially "good" think it is not "nice" either to think about or to know of such a fact! But they are altogether wrong in such mental attitude. I suppose their teaching is to blame for this.

The fertilization of eggs while they are still within the body of the female is accomplished by a union of the egg-producing organs of the female with the seminal-producing organs of the male, the fluid thus being brought into contact with the eggs it is to give complete life to. These organs are called "sex organs," and their union is known as "copulation." And this is the story of egg-fertilization as it takes place in an order of life which is higher than that of fishes.

And here, again, because of all sorts of happenings that may befall unhatched eggs, and of the difficulty that the seminal fluid may have in reaching the infertile eggs, located as they are within the body of the female, there is the same "prodigality of nature," both in the number of eggs produced and of that which fertilizes them, as we have noted in the lower life-forms. There is not such a tremendous excess of eggs produced among birds and fowls as there is among fishes, but the number of eggs "layed" is far in excess of those that are ever hatched, as everybody knows. And as to the number of spermatazoa which the male birds and fowls produce, this is still, as in the similar cases already noted, practically beyond computation!

Coming up a step higher in the realm of animal life-forms, we find yet another variation in the manner of reproduction, as follows: Here, not only are the eggs produced within the body of the female and fertilized there; but, after they are so fertilized, they are still retained within the female body, and there they grow and develop, for a shorter or a longer period of time, till in due time, infantile, but perfectly full-formed bodies are produced, after the kind of the animal that gave them being. When the young animal is fully formed within the body of the female, it is expelled from her body by what we call "birth." The time that it takes for the young of the different animals to become fully formed in the bodies of those which produce them, varies from a few days to several months, and is known as the "gestation period"; and the act of birth is scientifically called "parturition."

And here again there is the same surplus of eggs and of seminal fluid that obtains in all the cases we have so far noted. There is this difference, though, namely, that the more advanced animal-forms become, the fewer in number are the infertile eggs produced by the females for possible fertilization. On the other hand, there is no diminution of the proportionate number of fertilizing germs produced by male beings, no matter how high in the scale of life-forms we may go. The number of such germs, or spermatazoa, produced by each and every male being, from the lowest to the highest, during a lifetime, is for multitude, equal to that of the sands of the sea or the stars in the sky! But the number of such germs that actually succeed in affecting the fertilization of the eggs they are made to match, is comparatively infinitesimal! The great mass of these germs perish in their primitive form, and go for nothing, so far as their initial purpose is concerned! This tremendous "waste of life-giving material," as some people say it, is greatly deplored by many who, it would sometimes seem, think that they could have made a much better world than the one we live in, one which could have been run much more "economically," than ours now is! I wonder!

I have said all that I have thus far written upon this particular point, in order to lead my readers up to a full and wholesome realization of the essential facts that obtain in the reproduction of human beings in this world. It seems to me we ought all to be pretty well posted on the subject of reproduction in general, by this time, and, if we are, we are ready to take up intelligently, and in a right mental attitude, the subject of reproduction in the human species. Let us proceed to do just that.

In the first place, when we come to study this part of life-expression as it manifests itself in human beings, we find the same universal principle which is embodied in the truthful words of the old Latin phrase, *omne vivum ex ovo*, every living thing comes from an egg, to be in full force here as elsewhere; and that, in the working out of that principle, substantially, and for the most part, the same means and methods obtain that apply in the orders of being that are below mankind. That is, each human being in all the world has his or her physical beginning in an egg which is produced in an infertile condition by the female of the species; and this egg has to be fertilized by a germ which is produced by the male of the species, just as in the lower order of life-forms; that is, there must be a conjoining of the egg and the germ, in this case as in all others, before fertilization can take place.

Infertile human eggs originate from within the body of each human female, after they arrive at a suitable age, and for several years thereafter, from organs which are called ovaries. These are two in number, and are located where they are well protected, deeply embodied in the small of the back of the female body. A great number of these eggs, almost infinitely small, are present in the ovaries of each and all female human beings, from their earliest infancy, the number in each case being fixed definitely at the time of birth. In their primary state, or condition, and during the early years of the body that contains them, they are not capable of being fertilized; but, after the female body is sufficiently developed, they "ripen," or come to maturity, one by one, every twenty-eight days; and, one at a time, at the expiration of each such interval, they pass out of the ovaries and down into a part of the body where there is located an organ which corresponds to the egg-pocket in an apple-blossom; and here, like an apple-egg in a similar state, the human egg waits for the life-giving germ which alone can make it fertile. As already said, the male human being alone produces such germ from within his body, and it must be transmitted from the body of the male to that of the female before fertilization of the egg can take place. This transmission of the life-giving germ, or spermatazoa, from the body of the male to that of the female is effected in precisely the same manner as already noted in cases where the sex-organs of different life-forms are located in different individual bodies, and hence need not be repeated here. And, being thus brought together and into contact, the egg of the female unites with the germ of the male, and fertilization is thus accomplished. Such fertilization is known as "conception' and the female body in which conception has taken place is then said to be "pregnant."

And here, again, in this form of egg-fertilization, "the prodigality of nature" appears, just as in the other similar instances we have noted, though with this variation: In many of the orders of life below mankind, there are numbers of eggs, often multitudes, to be fertilized upon the meeting of these two life-elements, as we have already seen; but in the human species, there is only one egg presented for fertilization at any one time. However, the number of male fertilizing germs that are presented to fertilize such single egg, any *one* of which can fully accomplish such fertilization, and *only* one of which can be utilized for such purpose, is, as in similar cases, almost countless. At such meeting of an infertile human egg and the vitalizing germ which is to fertilize it, there are present between two and three millions of spermatazoa, and only *one* of these can, under any circumstances, be effective in producing the result for which they *all* exist! All the rest of this exceeding great multitude of germs which no man can number, must perish and count for nothing, so far as their vitalizing efficiency is concerned, as in all the other similar instances which we have noted. Note this fact quite well, as I shall refer to it later.

It hardly needs to be said, but to make the record complete, I add, that, after fertilization, the human egg remains within the body of the female, and there grows and develops during the "gestation period," as is the case with other animals, this period in the human species being nine months, when birth, or "parturition," takes place, and a new being enters into human life!

And this is the story of reproduction, as it applies to mankind! For the most part, it is but a repetition of similar phenomena in all life-forms; but there are ways in which it is peculiar to itself, as I shall at once proceed to point out.

And the first, and by far the most essential difference between reproduction in the human species and that in all other life-forms is that here, for the first time in all the series, the possible power of choice on the part of the individuals involved enters in and becomes a significant factor in the problem of the perpetuation of life's embodiments! And right here in this story, we begin to forcefully use the logical tools of explanation which I have been so long in fashioning, and which you have been so patient in noting. Right here begins the definite application of the method of Chance or of Choice as a factor in the reproduction of human beings, and we are now in a position to consider the issue intelligently and on the basis of righteousness rather than that of custom, or conventionality, or morality, or anything else whatsoever. And let us thank God that we can do just this!

It is easy for us now to see that, in all orders of life below mankind, all the phenomena of reproduction are matters of *must*, and not of *may* or *can;* of *instinct* merely, and hence that they all lie entirely outside the realm of the power of choice! (It might be well for the reader to pause for a moment just here, and think intently of the significance of what is involved in the statements made in the last few paragraphs, and then we will move on!)

I say that we can now see, at once, how impossible it is for choice to have any place whatever in the reproduction of life-forms in the orders of life below mankind. The infertile apple-egg has no choice as to its origin or as to the position it occupies in the apple-blossom; nor can it choose at all as to how and when it may receive the pollen-grain which is to fertilize it! The first of these items is, for it, a matter of *must*, and the second almost entirely a matter of *chance*. The apple-egg is where it is because it cannot help being there, and it may or may not get the fertilizing germ that it must have to perfect its being; and, in neither case can its own will, even if it had a will of its own, affect the situation in any way whatsoever! These are all facts which cannot be gainsaid in any way, and they are facts of the utmost significance in the main case we are now considering! Drive another stake right here!

And what is true of reproduction as it appears in the apple-trees is equally true of strawberries, and corn and clover and angle worms and fishes and birds and fowls and four-footed beasts, in a word, of all forms of life below mankind. In not one of these instances is the power of choice a possible factor in the phenomena involved! Below that line every element in the entire process is either irrevocably fixed by some power other than the individual involved, or else it is a matter of chance, pure and simple!

But when we come up as far in the scale of life-expression as human beings, there we find at least the *possibility* of choice becoming a factor in the phenomenon of reproduction! True, many of the irrevocably fixed conditions that obtain in the lower orders of life still persist in this realm of being. The production of primitive egg-cells and of fertilizing germs is still entirely beyond the control of the individuals in which these elements appear, just as truly as is the case in lower forms of life; but the item of the fertilization or the non-fertilization of embryo eggs in human beings is at least within the bounds of possible human control! Here the possible power of choice, at least, exists! The question at stake is, is it right that such possibility should be deliberately taken advantage of and utilized by the human beings in which it certainly has a being; or should mankind, like all other life-forms, continue to be subject to fate and chance in the exercise of this most important of all life's functions? Here is the crux of the whole issue to be considered in the case we are now trying!

And the item to settle, and to settle once for all, is, *what is right in this matter?* And the answer to this question is not to be determined by what anybody says about it, no matter who such anybody may be; it is not to be settled by any "authority," merely as such, no matter what the same may be, or how and where it may be located; its rightness or wrongness is not to be disclosed in terms of morality, custom, or conventionality, or of man-made laws, as such; but the whole issue must be determined by its *righteousness* or *unrighteousness;* and this can only be found out by the effects which the exercise of such power of choice produces upon the individuals who exercise it, or upon any other person or persons upon whom its exercise may have an influence, or "land." Such method of settling the rightness or wrongness of exercising the power of choice in this case is in harmony with the basic laws of determining the correctness of human acts, which we have studied a few pages back; and it is the only way of finally testing out the issue to an ultimate conclusion. Let us proceed to do just that.

It goes without saying that this method of settling this issue involves a great number of items, both general and particular; so many, in fact, that they cannot all be considered, as they deserve to be, in a book the size of the one I am now writing. However, the chief of all these can be noted and some conclusions can be established therefrom which will be of such general application that they will practically serve in rightly determining all the issues in point.

And right here I want to call the attention of my readers as to just what the issue is that I am now considering. I am not talking about the taking of human life, even at its earliest stages! I am not talking about "abortion," that is, the destruction of a fertilized human egg at any time after the gestation period has begun. Such an act as that is another issue altogether, from the one we are talking about, and with which this present discussion has nothing whatever to do, as I may enlarge upon later. However, it should be said, just here, that the fact is that the laws and regulations which are now on the statute books of the United States, and of many of the several States in the Union, make no distinction whatever between these two separate issues, but count them as one and the same, and prescribe equal punishments for any violations of such statutes, all and several. The pity of it! Yes, the folly of it, not to say the blunder, the abomination and the wickedness of it! But more of this later.

And here, in considering the possibility of exercising the human will, or choice rather than chance, in determining whether or not human egg-cells shall be fertilized, in general or in any particular case, we fall back on the trio of *desire, imagination* and *ingenuity,* which we have already carefully studied. Taking these up, one by one, as they apply in the present situation, it is certain that the *desire* to effect such control exists among all human beings to whom is legally given the right of propagating the human species, namely, all married people! That is, all married people would prefer, if they could have their wish about it, if their *desire* could be fulfilled, to have the matter of egg-cell fertilization, in their particular case at least, entirely under their own control. That such *desire* is universal among all intelligent and thoughtful married people is beyond denial!

And, thus desiring, the *imagination* of these people proceeds to search for the means of realization of such desire; after which their *ingenuity* proceeds to work out what their imagination suggests. This is the universal experience of all married people, to say the least. But if any one should tell how such experience has worked out, what ways and means for realizing such desires as imagination has suggested to married people, and what their ingenuity has produced—if any one should ever make a report of this, as the laws of the United States now are, the man or the woman who would do this would land in the penitentiary forthwith! However, this can be said without danger of incurring such penalty; namely, that even the most earnest advocates of "not meddling with nature's methods," all unanimously agree in the rightfulness of *one* way of making human egg-cells and spermatazoa ineffective, that is, of virtually preventing "conception," namely, by entire abstinence from the act which would bring these two vital elements into contact with each other! This seems to be a sort of universally approved and generally accepted unwritten law; or, perhaps better, a universally approved and generally accepted and adopted exception to a written law, (if such written law actually includes this method which really accomplishes a result which the statute itself forbids!)

In any event, even the most ardent endorsers and supporters of the law as it now stands, still insist that it is right for married people to practice such method of living, and they urge conformity to it with the utmost zeal.

Now let us see just what such method does and just how it does it:

In the first place, it surely prevents "conception"! No one can deny that! Still further, there is no denying the fact that this method does bring the element of the human will into the case. It certainly substitutes choice in the place of chance as a controlling factor in the premises! What it practically does is to deliberately keep from realization possibilities which might eventuate otherwise but for the inhibition thus enforced! It renders both the egg-cells produced by the human female, and the life-giving germs produced by the male human being, entirely incapable of attaining the results for which both exist! It leaves to "nature" the work of making a complete, rather than a partial destruction of *all* of these germs, *every one of them*, egg-cells and their proper fertilizers, both and all! To be sure, "nature" destroys the overwhelming majority of both of these, anyhow, as we have already seen; and in preventing the meeting of the two elements by totally abstaining from the sexual act which would bring them together, and so destroying them *all* by such means, the ingenuity of married people by this exceptionally approved method, only carries one step further a process which "nature" continually practices in limitless measure! The question is, would married people, if they *never* engaged in the sexual act which alone can bring about the fertilization of the human egg-cell, and in this way prevented conception—would such people be doing right or wrong by such manner of living? The way to find out the right or wrong in this case is to learn how such manner of living results in its effects upon the parties concerned, the husbands and wives involved.

In the first place, let it be said that such manner of living, by husbands and wives, that is, an entire abstinence of sexual commerce, is so rare as to be almost a negligible quantity. In all my investigations, I have found only one such case; but I have found one where such manner of living was actually maintained for a number of years. (For the better assurance of the reader, I add that I have every reason to believe that this couple did actually live as I have stated they did. In any event, please count it true that they did so, for the sake of the argument which is to follow, if for no other reason. But that such cases are rare is well known by everybody. Hence this parenthetical note.) The question is, did these parties, if they lived as they say they lived, do wrong by living in this way; and, if they did do wrong, in just what particular did that wrong doing consist? To find these things out, the case will have to be studied quite carefully in detail, as follows:

This husband and wife belonged to what we call "middle class people." They lived in a city where both found employment, he as a clerk in a store, and she as a stenographer in an office. They "fell in love with each other," as the phrase goes, and wanted to marry, and did so. *But!* They were in quite moderate circumstances, both of them, and they felt that it would not be best, or even right, for them to have a child, or children, till they were able to take proper care of it, or them! And they knew that by entirely refraining from the sexual act they could totally eliminate the possibility of becoming parents! Knowing this, they acted accordingly. That is, by the deliberate action of their wills, by the exercise of the power of *choice*, and not at all by *chance*, they kept from reproducing after their kind. Did they do wrong?

Well, according to the rules for determining the rightness or the wrongness of human actions that we have already noted, let us bring this case into the court of common sense, as it were, and try it out.

In the first place: How did such manner of living affect the parties themselves, physically, mentally and spiritually? As to the first, so far as I could learn, both the husband and the wife were at least averagely well physically, during the three or more years that I knew them, and during which time they practiced absolute continence. How long this condition afterward continued, I cannot say, as, after that time, they moved to the far West, and I lost sight of them. Mentally, they were certainly able to hold their respective positions, as long as I knew them; and spiritually, they stood fairly well, at least up to the average among people in their walks of life. So much for the result of this manner of living as it "landed" upon these two people individually.

Whether such a way of living was abnormal or not, is beside the issue, so far as this discussion is concerned. It was certainly unusual, as already said; but that item in the count we need not consider. That it could be generally practiced by husbands and wives as they go, with as good results as obtained in this case, my own observations and studies lead me greatly to doubt. I have known many cases where a similar manner of living was attempted, to the extent of confining the sexual act to that of a reproductive purpose only, and almost without exception such attempts have resulted harmfully to the physical, mental and spiritual condition of the husbands and wives concerned. I have known some such cases, where nervous breakdown and mental upsetting have come from such repression; and I have more than once seen such untoward condition remedied, and the parties restored to health and soundness in body, mind and spirit, by the abandonment of such inhibition, and the establishment of a mode of life that was in harmony with their natural desires, rather than in conformity to what somebody, or some books have said. This is a sort of side remark, apart from the main issue; but it is so important that I feel that I will be pardoned by the reader for making it as I have. I may refer to this point at greater length in a later chapter.

If these parties did no harm to themselves by not permitting the vital elements of reproduction to come into contact with each other, by deliberately refraining from the sexual act which would have united them, the question still remains, according to the rule for determining right and wrong under which this case is being tried, did they wrong any one else by doing as they did?

And here comes in the claim that they owed a *duty* to society, and to the state and to the church if they failed to contribute their quota of children for the uses and needs of these institutions in days to come. And to this claim from these sources is sometimes added an injunction or command which is held to have come from Jehovah himself, as embodied in the words of the Bible, "increase and multiply and replenish the earth." For all these reasons, husbands and wives have been taught, and still are taught, that they are doing wrong if they do not have children if it is possible for them to do so; and this view of the situation has been held in such esteem by certain who have believed that they are possessed of the authority to dictate in the premises, that husbands and wives have been commanded to bear children under penalty if they refused to heed the order given to them! That is, according to this theory, it is held to be wrong, if not absolutely wicked for married people who have in themselves the possibilities of reproducing after their kind, and who possess the legal right to exercise the same, to refrain from utilizing such possibilities by a deliberate act of the will, that is, by choice!

In the first place, it must be acknowledged that the laws of the United States as they now stand, apparently make it a criminal offense if such possibilities are even limited or curbed in any way! This condition of affairs virtually amounts to demanding by law that the powers of reproduction which are possessed by all those who are legally entitled to function in this way, shall be utilized to the limit of their possibilities! The principle at the basis of such an order of things can be none other than this: *They can, and hence they must!* It is for these reasons that it is held that this young couple whom we now have "on the carpet" did a wrong to others by not having children. Let us look a bit further into this claim, as follows:

The essential point in this claim is that society, and the state and the church need men and women for supporters in the coming generation, and that all those who *can* contribute to the furnishing of such supporters are "slackers" if they fail to "make good"! Suppose we concede the point for the moment, namely, that those who can, should, and continue the argument on that basis!

As just said, the whole crux of the situation lies in the claim that it is the duty of those who *can* have children, to fulfil their possibilities. And there are those who assert that such possibilities should be carried to the ultimate limit of attainment, regardless of every item but that of the number of children that can be produced. Grant this for a moment, and see what comes from it. On this basis, the question at once arises in the minds of all who are willing to think this situation through to a logical conclusion: Just where does this "*can*," this *duty* in the line of possibilities begin? How far back does such responsibility go?

As things now are, only those who are married can legally have children. But, as a matter of fact, practically *all adult* human beings *can reproduce* after their kind! They all possess the power to do so! They could have children if they would place themselves where they might legally do so! *All* female human beings produce infertile egg-cells every twenty-eight days, and *all* male human beings produce untold millions of spermatazoa which could fertilize the same, if they had the opportunity to do so. The question is, do not all these people *owe a duty* to society, and the State, and the church to live up to their possibilities in this item of reproduction?

This is not saying that all these people should bear children out of wedlock, but it is raising the issue as to whether they have any right to *deliberately refuse* to enter into a condition of life where the having of children would be possible. Has any woman the *right* to deliberately permit *all* the unfertilized egg-cells she produces to go to waste? Has any man the right to suffer *all* the fertilizing germs he produces to perish? Have they any right to exercise the power of choice in the premises, and to wilfully refrain from placing themselves in a position where they could respond to the call or demand of society, and the State, and the church for supporters in the days to come? Have unmarried people a right to remain unmarried, under these conditions? Or, to carry the issue to a finality, have any adult human beings who possess the power of reproduction, any right to deliberately determine that they will never, under any circumstances, become fathers or mothers?

It seems to me that the point we are now considering, when thus logically carried to an ultimate issue, reveals, with the utmost clearness, certain items that are clouded, to say the least, in the minds of many good people. Let us see just what an affirmative answer to this question would involve.

Of course, no one could claim for a moment that all single people should be compelled by law to marry, or that it is wrong for any who choose to do so, to remain in life-long celibacy. To enforce such compulsion for the first, or to refuse to permit such action on the part of the latter, would be wholly at variance to the principle of individual liberty, and amount to nothing less than unbearable tyranny! And yet, all these people by a deliberate act of the will, by exercising the power of choice, do keep apart the human life-germs where meeting might at least result in the *chance* of reproduction of the human species! And if it is right for *these people* to thus exercise the power of *choice* in the matter of bringing children into this world, rather than to take *chances* in the premises, by this method of accomplishing such a result, who should say, or by what right shall the claim be made that *other* human beings may not rightfully do, at least occasionally, what they do perpetually?

Suppose you try to think that question through, and to answer it in the light of reason and common sense, rather than according to fixed ideas, or an established conventionality, and see what comes from so doing! If you will do this, and are willing to acknowledge the conclusion you come to; and if your mind and mine are in any way related to each other, so far as the ability to reason rightly is concerned, I am sure we shall both be compelled to acknowledge that, so far as the civilization we live in is concerned, it is now really practically universally held to be right to render *all* the reproductive germ-cells which human beings may produce, ineffective by keeping them apart, by means of entirely refraining from the sexual act which would bring them together! But if we reach this conclusion, see what follows: Such a conclusion is so sweeping, so far-reaching, and, more than all, so at variance with what we have all thoughtlessly held in mind up to the present time, that it needs to be reviewed once more to make sure that it is really correct. Let us make such review:

It is held by *everybody* that it is not only right, but a duty and a virtue of the highest sort, for all *unmarried* persons to render ineffective *all* the germ-cells they produce! No one ever thinks of charging such people with "murder" or criminality of any sort if they deliberately keep such germs apart. No one says that they owe a duty to society, or the State, or the church, or anybody else, to place themselves in a condition where they could legally bring such germs together. Everybody is agreed about this, up to this point. And this can mean nothing else than that the rendering of human life-germs inefficient by keeping them apart, is not wrong, as such, and in and of itself! And this, in turn, means, must mean, that the keeping of human life-germs apart is not of itself wrong, or wicked, or a sin! Well then, if it is not a wrong, in and of itself, to keep such germs apart, by what law of equal rights for all can it be held to be a sin for some people and not a sin for other people to keep such germs from meeting? Can there be exceptions to a general rule, which will make it a crime for some people to do what other people may do with impunity? And, under these conditions, can any one, or any number of ones, by law, or by any other rightful means, make that wrong for some which is right for others, *all of such parties being of the same original make-up, and endowed with the same original powers and abilities in the premises?* If there is any such quality as justice or right, anywhere in the world, such could never be evoked to bring about and maintain so unjust and unfair a condition of things as such arbitrary ruling would constitute! What is fair and right for one human being in this regard, must be fair and right for all other human beings, the possibilities being constantly equal and the same in all these cases, as they surely are in this particular. There can be no escape from this conclusion, as all sane people must admit.

So then, by this study, we are forced to the conclusion that the keeping of human life-germs apart is not a wrong, in and of itself, and that this fact is generally acknowledged as correct, *provided* the method of making such germs inefficient is confined to that of wholly refraining from the act which would give some of them a chance to become effective, that is, by living a life of absolute continence. Let so much be counted as settled.

And being settled, and settled in this way, we can discuss the case of the two young people whose deliberate act of perpetually refraining from the sexual act kept the germ-cells they produced apart, and so *by choice* kept them from bearing children. In doing as they did, they did no more than millions of *unmarried* people do; and if such act was not wrong in the one case, by no law of right can it be counted wrong in another case—in their case!

"But," some one says, "suppose all married people should do as these young people did, what would become of Society and the State and the church under these circumstances?" The question is not pertinent, so far as it applies to these people being *married* is concerned! If it is urged at all, it must be asked in this way: Suppose *all* people should live lives of absolute continence, what would happen then? That is, if the question is asked at all, it must be made to apply to every human being who is possessed of the possibilities of supplying the needs of Society, the State and the Church with supporters; and so long as individual liberty means anything at all, no such wholesale extension of responsibility could be considered for a moment. These young friends, whose case we have tried, were under no more obligation to supply these needs after they were married than they were before; and, in neither case or condition were they any more responsible for supplying these needs than were, or are, all the millions of their brother and sister human beings, married or single, in all the world, who possess the means for bringing about such results! Is it not written "God is no respecter of persons?" and what is right for one who has possibilities for producing results of any given kind, must be equally right for all who are like-wise equipped! "The elementary laws never apologize," but, impartially, they apply alike to all! "Who hath ears to hear, let him hear!"

And now see what follows from this chain of reasoning, if the principle it has led us to is correct, as it undeniably is! The point is established that the keeping of human germ-cells apart by the exercise of the power of choice is not wrong, in and of itself, and it is further universally held that it is right and proper for *any* human beings to exercise such power of choice in this matter, by entirely refraining from the sex act which might bring the germs together, by living a life of absolute continence. That is, the conclusion is reached that it is no crime to keep these germs apart, *provided* the rendering of them inefficient is brought about *in a certain way*. But such conclusion inevitably suggests the question whether or not this one way, or any one way of keeping these germs from efficiency has a monopoly in the premises? If it is not wrong to keep human germ-cells from realizing their possibilities by *one* method, is it wrong to bring about the same result by *some other method?* That is, is there anything sacred or beyond competition, in the method which is now so universally approved, or may other methods be rightfully utilized for producing the same results?

With the point established, that the deliberate keeping of germ-cells from fully functioning is no crime, in and of itself, would it not seem that the manner of bringing about such results becomes a matter of indifference, so far as the result itself is concerned? To be sure, any such method that might be used for such purpose must be of such nature that it will work no harm, physically, mentally or spiritually, to those who adopt it; but its rightness or wrongness must be judged from such standpoint alone, and none other. The rightness or wrongness of the results produced being established, the rightness or wrongness of the method which produced the results must be determined on its own merits.

And this brings us to the consideration of the main issue of all, namely: Is it right that the sexual act which nature utilizes as the only means of bringing human germ-cells together should be used for any other purpose than that of affecting such union of these vital forces? Or, to put it the other way about: Is it wrong, or sinful for human beings to give their sex nature any other mode of expression than that of offering an opportunity for germ-cells to unite? And this leads us back to the original question as to whether sex in the human species is designed by the Maker of sex to serve any other purpose than that of reproduction? And the answer to this involves the fact of the "plus of humanity" concerning which much has been said in previous chapters. This is an issue, in and of itself, which I can only mention here, and which I shall fully discuss later on. Till then, let it rest at the point to which I have so far brought it.

Meantime, while we wait, there is one more item to be considered in the matter of rendering human germ-cells inefficient through the exercise of the power of choice on the part of men and women, and that is, the right, or rights, of the cells themselves, or of certain individuals of them in particular. It is held, in some quarters, that at least *some* of these germ-cells have a right to come to the full expression of their possibilities, and that to keep them from so doing is wrong and a sin. This is a point that is worthy of looking into, especially because of the quite extended field in which it is held to be true.

Those who hold this view declare that germ-cells possess life, and that it is a sin to destroy such life by an act of deliberate human choice. Let us look into such a proposition in the light of common sense, and of things as they are, as well.

There is no doubt about human germ-cells possessing life, and the multiplicity of such life is almost beyond computation. As already noted, for more than thirty years of her life, every normal female being produces at least thirteen unfertilized egg-cells every year; and the number of spermatazoa that a normal healthy man produces in a life-time is practically past finding out. In the ordinary course of nature, the great bulk of these perish, as I have more than once shown, and never reach an attainment which they *all* possess the possibility of fulfilling! The average human female who reaches the age of fifty years produces more than four hundred egg-cells during her lifetime, and even with those who have "large families" only a comparatively few of these ever attain to the full the inherent possibilities which they all possess; while, with the average mother who bears three or four children only, not one per cent of such germ-cells are utilized for reproduction. And amongst men, all and several, the product of life-germs which are made ready for each possible sex-meeting exceed two-and-a-half millions, every germ of which possesses life in itself. And the number of sex-meetings that a normal man is capable of affecting and still maintain good health, is, in many cases, from the age of twenty to sixty, not less than the number of days he lives during that period of his life. And yet, though all these numberless germ-cells, of both sorts, thus possess life, are truly alive, in and of themselves, they nearly all die, or at least do not fulfill the purpose of reproduction for which they primarily exist.

"But," say the devotees of the theory we are now considering, "it is nature which thus disposes of this immense surplus, and man cannot be held responsible for what nature does. The only thing for humanity to do, under these conditions, is to let nature do her work, and not to interfere with her, in any way. And deliberately to do, even occasionally, what she does continually, is to meddle with her working, and that is something that man should never do, where life is concerned!" This is what the advocates of this theory *say,* though it hardly seems possible that sane and thoughtful human beings could even conceive such an idea!

For, look you, if this saying be correct, what shall we say of those who refuse to marry, or who vow that they will never do so? These, by a deliberate act of their own will, render *all* their germ-cells inefficient! They condemn every one of these elements which possess life to absolute extermination! They "meddle with nature" to the nth degree, and none of the advocates of this theory we are now talking about molest them or make them afraid in the least! And yet—oh, brethren and sisters, it won't do! The theory which insists on married people utilizing to the limit of possibilities, *all* the germ-cells they produce, is based on nothing but an alleged "authority" which has no foundation whatever to rest upon, but which is like unto a man who would endeavor to stand in mid-air on the wooden legs of a begged premise, and thus equipped, assume to defy the laws of gravity and overturn a world!

It was an enthusiastic advocate of this theory who has insisted that, amongst married people, every possible opportunity should be offered germ-cells to unite, and that every married couple should have as many children as they could possibly produce, utterly regardless of anything but the number of progeny they bring forth. Another of these has said that it is better to be born deaf, dumb and blind, or so diseased that one could live for only a moment, than not to be born at all. Others of this belief picture myriads of souls, waiting with outstretched hands, begging to be born into this world, and that every possible opportunity should be offered these anxious beings to realize their desires; and hence, they argue, it is wicked for married people to in any way hinder what they so much long for. The answer to such a demand is the one already given, namely, why confine this insistence to married people, or why blame these alone if their prayers are not answered?

The simple truth is that neither those who hold this theory, nor any one else, really knows, to a certainty, anything about what the condition of individual life is preceding birth, or how or when or where such identities originate. The wisest remark on this score that I have ever known of, was made by a sage of ripe years and experience, who wrote me a letter in which he said: "From the womb of Infinity, in the realm of mystery, we are born; but where, or when, or how we come into being, mortals may never know." And that sentence, I think, tells all that any, even the wisest, know about the marvelous fact of the presence of individual human beings in this world. And, on this basis, it would seem good sense, at least, not to bring individual beings into this world, unless they can have at least a reasonable opportunity to become what it would seem the Maker of human beings designed that they might attain to. Doesn't that seem like a wholesome proposition?

The fact is that the holders of these theories base their philosophies on an other-worldliness, rather than on a this-worldliness, when reason and common sense would seem to indicate that the conditions that individuals have to meet in this world should be the first to consider, when the item of giving such an individual a being and a place in time and space hangs in the balance awaiting a decision. And that such an issue should be carefully considered and wisely and thoughtfully acted upon must appeal to all sane people as just and right, ever and always.

Under these conditions, to insist that human germ-cells have a right to be brought together whenever opportunity for their union is possible, regardless of the conditions into which the being might be born, which this uniting might result in, is not only folly, but, in many instances, a positive crime! Whatever rights to coalesce such germ-cells may possess, their rights must be set over against the rights of the individuals that may be born if this union is effected; and to permit them to have their way, when such action would result in the misery and woe of what they produce, cannot be right or reasonable or sane! Why it is urged in some quarters I shall point out in due time.

To sum up a bit, just here, it seems to me that we have now established the fact that it is not wrong for human beings, married or unmarried, by a deliberate act of the will, that is by choice, to render human germ-cells inefficient, which is only another way of saying that it is not wrong for them to have children by choice rather than by chance. The point yet left to consider is as to whether it is right to use *one* way, and *one* way only, in bringing about this result.

Without any further beating about the bush, let us proceed at once to state the issue, as follows: As the case now stands, as a matter of fact, practically all married people do engage in the act which may result in bringing together the germ-cells they produce. And they do this without the definite purpose or desire of reproduction. That is, in this way, in the vast majority of cases, they "chance" the issue as to whether the germs unite or not! They never know, to a certainty, whether fertilization will or will not take place from this sexual meeting, and they blindly take chances, one way or the other. It is because of this undeniable fact that it remains true to this day, that at least ninety per cent of the children that are born into this world come into being not by choice, but by chance! The question is, in view of all that has gone before in this book, are these results the best that the desire and the imagination and the ingenuity of mankind can produce; and is it wrong that better results should be sought for and established, if ever they can be found? That is, if some way or ways could be found by means of which husbands and wives could determine by choice how many, and when and how they should have children, would the finding of such way, and the practice of the same be wrong? And this brings us once more to the issue of the rightness or the wrongness of sex-expression for purposes other than that of reproduction, and so makes a fit ending for the chapter on the pros and cons of the issue at stake, as we have so far considered it.

CHAPTER XI

SOME REVIEWS AND DEMONSTRATIONS OF THE PLUS OF HUMANITY, AS IT APPLIES TO SEX IN THE HUMAN SPECIES

Before entering directly upon the definite study to be made in this particular chapter, it will be well to refresh our minds somewhat as to what is comprehended in the phrase "The Plus of Humanity."

So far, we have seen that The Plus of Humanity, as used in these studies, includes all those qualities and expressions which exist in human beings over and above all similar qualities and expressions which exist in any and all forms of life below mankind; and that it is this something added to the animal man which makes him a human being!

Thus, it was shown in a previous chapter that in the item of physical appetite for food (a quality which, in its fundamental forms, human beings share in common with the brute creation), there is an added something in the manner in which this quality expresses itself in the human species, over and above its manner of expression in lower forms of life. This same characteristic was pointed out as equally in evidence in the case of eye-sight and hearing; and, with like force, it might have been noted that it also applies to the senses of touch and smell.

In all these forms of life-expression, it was shown that there is, in the human species, a double manner of manifestation, a two-fold means of serving and upbuilding the beings of whose existence they form an integral part. The first mode of expression of these qualities in human beings deals almost entirely with the material part of mankind, in practically an identical manner in which it functions in lower life-forms. The second, in all its varied demonstrations, has to do with the mental and spiritual upbuilding of the beings upon whom its influence is thrown. And because the mental and spiritual man is of far more moment, is of a higher order of being, than is his material make-up, for this reason, the form of life-expression which constitutes the plus of humanity is of far more importance, and of more genuine worth, so far as the progress of the race is concerned, than is that which deals chiefly with his grosser elements. This principle has been shown as undeniably true as it applies to all the human characteristics thus far mentioned, and it is the business of this chapter to demonstrate its equal applicability to sex, as this quality exists in the human species.

With regard to this phase of the issue, let it again be noted that mankind constitutes the only species in which this double form of expression of the inherent qualities that go to make up life-forms manifests itself in any way. But that such two-fold form of expression does exist in the human race, no one will deny, now that the fact is pointed out. And, this being the case, since man has the possibility of such double form of expression, it is at least a reasonable presumption that this added quality was given him for his use, wherever it can be made to apply; and, hence, a something to be cultivated and made the most of, rather than, in any of its phases, to be ignored, or uprooted, or despised, or counted as an error in man's construction, or as a sin in its functioning and results, whenever it is in evidence!

Indeed, all history shows that it is by the exercise of these qualities which constitute the Plus of Humanity that all human progress has been brought about. And to destroy, or fail to utilize this part of man's possessions in every realm of its activity, would result not only in returning the race to barbarism, but, ultimately, it would make the human species one form of brute existence, merely that and nothing more!

If the cooking of food and the use of table furnishings should be abandoned, only the lowering of the standards of human life could result from such elimination of these time-proven helps to human progress. If all that comes to man through eyesight, except the item of keeping him out of the ditch and of showing him where to find food, should be abrogated, he could not continue to live the life that he now lives. If the ears of man could bring him no more than animals' ears bring to them, he would be no more than the mere flesh and blood which they are. But man is more than flesh and blood, and it is the Plus of his Humanity which has made him so!

This is all a review, but it is well to call it to mind, again, just here.

And now let us advance a step and endeavor to show that what is true of the Plus of Humanity, as it applies to the qualities we have so far discussed, is equally true in the matter of sex, item for item!

On this count, let us first note that the uniqueness of this quality, as it exists in the human species, is just as pronounced in the matter of sex as it is in the senses we have considered. No animal below man possesses the possibility of more than one form of sex-expression! In all the lower orders of life, this part of their make-up serves *one* purpose, and one only, namely, that of reproduction of the species, of a continuation of some particular form of life like unto themselves. More than this it is not, more than this it cannot be or become.

Besides all this, in all forms of life below mankind, sex-functioning, like the uses of hunger and seeing and hearing, is wholly a matter of instinct; and, as such, is in no way subject to the influence or control of the will. That is, in all these forms of life, reproduction is neither a matter of chance nor of choice, but is as fixed as fate, a something that the beings which are subject to its dictates and directions can neither increase, nor diminish, nor regulate in any way, by any determination of their own. In this regard, there is nothing put into their keeping, or which exists as a part of their make-up, which they could utilize on their own initiative, if they chose to do so! They are simply forms of life which are forced to obey what they have no power to resist or divert, or overcome! As some one has well said, all these life-forms are practically sex-less, except at such times as instinct virtually compels them to function in this part of their being.

Now all this means that there is a possibility of sex-expression in human beings which is entirely beyond that which exists in any other life-forms, just as there are possibilities of the exercise of the five senses in the human species in ways which mere animals know nothing of. And this difference in the possibilities of sex-expression puts humanity in a class by itself among life-forms, in the item of sex, just as truly as the difference in the possibilities of eye-sight and hearing, as these qualities can be exercised by human beings, removes them from the sphere of mere animality.

It is for this reason that the treatment of the whole sex question, as it exists in humanity, can never be rightly undertaken or worked out, if it be considered solely as though it were merely an animal adjunct.

The utility and the value of sex-expression as a human quality, are as unique and as varied as are those of any other of the human faculties. This is a fact which is almost universally ignored or denied by multitudes of people who ought to know better than to treat the subject thus; and it is such neglect or denial that results in untold misery and woe to countless human beings who might live happy and wholesome lives if this part of their being were properly recognized, its needs provided for and its wholesome training and cultivation righteously undertaken. But, as things now are, all social conventions and even legal enactments make it well nigh impossible to realize such results. But that these conditions will not always obtain is as certain as is the progress of the human race. It may be slow in coming, but that it will some day arrive is as sure as sunrise.

Again, the Plus of Humanity, as it applies to sex, is shown by the universal practice among those to whom such manner of living is permitted, of forms of sex-expression which do not exist, and which are impossible among the lower forms of life. Married men and women habitually express themselves sexually, in ways which, in and of themselves, have nothing whatever to do with reproduction, as such, either by way of purpose or of desire! More than this, the experiences of great numbers of these husbands and wives, in this regard, prove, beyond the possibility of doubt, that such experiences, *when they are perfectly mutual*, promote the well-being of the parties thereto, physically, mentally and spiritually! When such individuals are truly mated, such manifestations of their mutual love result in good health, mental stimulation and spiritual uplift and exaltation. As previously noted, such people are not only longer lived than the average, but they come far nearer being normal human beings than those who cannot, or do not, experience these wholesome delights of life. They are better natured, wiser, happier and holier than are those who cannot express themselves in this way.

Nor is this manner of sex-expression by any means confined to the sex organs, as such. I have termed it the "affectional" part of sex-expression, and its varied manifestations include every possible exchange of the natural impulses of men and women, all the way from a touch of hands, a glance of the eyes, a meeting of the lips, to the very climax of sexual union. All these are, when absolutely mutual, but the ways of love; and being so, they are the ways of life; for, in the human species, only the ways of love are really the ways of life.

But, alack and alas, as married people now live, how few of them ever realize these greatest of all possibilities! Could they do so, divorce courts could go out of business, and the places which once knew such abnormalities would know them no more forever. For divorce courts are really abnormalities! They are nothing more nor less than the natural and inevitably necessary result of an abnormal manner of life among men and women who are only legally held together; and what law alone has united, law has an equal right to separate! But, in both cases, the whole affair is an abnormality. As a matter of fact, in a true marriage, where a man and a woman are joined together because they are each other's natural complements and mates, with such, divorce courts can have nothing to do. Never was such a legal and man-made device called upon to dissolve or to dissever a union that was truly grounded in the absolute mutuality of the parties thereto! And it is further true, that no divorce court was ever called upon to separate a husband and wife the affectional side of whose lives was mutually responsive and mutually responded to! In the presence of a fact like this, it would seem to be true that the best way in the world to rid society of the divorce courts would be to teach husbands and wives how to live lives of normal sex-affectional expression! Isn't that good sense?

Because, you see, divorce courts are thronged with husbands and wives who quarrel over the reproductive side of married life, as they permit it to become involved in the affectional part of sex-expression. They either fail to recognize the reality and the value of such mode of expression, as such; or through ignorance, or carelessness, or stupidity they fail to develop it or practice it. It is perfectly safe to say that never a divorce was asked for, where such a difference regarding the sex-expression of the parties concerned was not in evidence as the chief cause of all the trouble involved! But let us not wander too far from our main theme in pursuing this particular phase of the subject in hand.

It is held by some materialists that the delights of the affectional expression of the sex nature in human beings are, as it were, imposed upon mankind merely as a stimulant whose purpose it is to give the chance of reproduction a greater range than it would otherwise have. Their claim is that if the matter of reproduction were removed from the sphere of instinct as it exists among mere animals, and made to come within the realm of will-control, as it has come to be among human beings, the danger would be that the race would cease to breed, unless some extra means was brought to bear upon individuals to lead them to do what they would fail to do but for this added inducement to produce a required result! This theory is on par with that which holds that the long neck of the giraffe was acquired by its possessor continuously reaching for the topmost leaves on trees, or that the elephant's tail fell into "innocuous desuetude" because its hide was so thick that flies could not bite through it, and so did not need to be whisked off! And yet, curious fact, this same nearly tail-less quadruped will stand and lash flies off its side all day with a wisp of hay held in its trunk, and a giraffe will eat grass like an ox with tall trees standing all about! What wonder that Whitman says: "No theory is of any account whatever that does not tally with the amplitude of the whole earth."

And this theory as to why an extra urgency had to be given to man to make him breed, is just as foolish as is the way of accounting for the long neck of the giraffe, or the short tail of the elephant. As well argue that the purpose of the cooking of food and of well-set tables is a necessity, which was added to the human race to keep men from starving to death, or that pictures and reading were invented to keep them from going blind, or that music came into being to save man's ears from growing shut! No! No! None of these theories will account for, or are at all needed to account for the fact of the existence of the affectional side of sex expression. It is a quality which is added to this part of man's make-up for the cultivation of his higher nature, of his mental and spiritual characteristics, just as good cooking and pleasingly set tables, and pictures and books, and fine music, and art of all sorts and descriptions, have come into being to minister to something more than the mere animal in man, namely, to the Plus of Humanity. These are all the product of a "creative evolution," as Bergson would say, rather than the necessity of a material and unguided evolution, whose chief factor for producing varied results was chance, and whose means of perpetuating the same was crass force and favoring environment. Affectional sex-expression came into being for the same cause, and in the same manner as these other stimulants to a larger life have come; and, as such, it should be recognized and provided for, and righteously cultivated.

Again: The fact that affectional sex-expression belongs to The Plus of Humanity rather than to the more material part of man's make-up, is proved by this, namely, that, as such, it is no necessary element in the matter of reproduction! The fertilization of human egg-cells may be brought about without in the least involving any exercise whatever of the affectional part of sex-expression. All that is necessary to produce such a result is to bring the two elements, the egg-cell and its vivifying complement, together, in a proper environment, and the desired effect is secured. This not only can be done, but has been done, by purely mechanical means, through the use of a surgical instrument! In this way, all that is really essential for producing "conception" can be accomplished, and with it the affectional element of sex-expression need have no more to do than it would have in the case of any other surgical operation, as the amputation of an arm, or the removal of a vermiform appendix! Just as table-furnishings and cooked food are not absolute necessities for the preservation of the physical life of man, just so affectional sex-expression is not a necessity for the preservation of the human species. True, in their rightful use, they both add much to the well-being of the physical life of mankind; but they are an added help to produce such results; they belong to the *plus* of man's being, and, as such, they should not be treated as though they were merely animal qualities. Their chief function is to build up the mental and spiritual part of man's being; and it is for this purpose rather than for any other that they should be utilized.

Of course, well-furnished tables and well-cooked food may eventuate in mere palate gratification, or even in gross gluttony itself; but this is not the fault of these additions to the partaking of food on the part of human beings, nor should these helpful accessories be abandoned or abolished because some people abuse their possible beneficient effects. In like manner that part of sex-expression which belongs to the plus of humanity should not be abandoned or destroyed because there are people who abuse its helpful influences. There are those who abuse the reading of books or the admiration of pictures, or who go music-mad; but not for these reasons should the art of printing or of painting be abolished, or that of music be rooted out! Analogy is not always conclusive, but it holds good in these comparisons to the utmost degree! Think on this!

Once more: Another proof that affectional sex-expression is no necessary part of reproduction, and so, that it belongs wholly, as such, to the Plus of Humanity, is the fact that multitudes of wives bear children, sometimes many of them, without experiencing, in the least degree, any of the emotions and upbuilding influences which should accompany all sex manifestations between married people. What such wives do is to yield their bodies, often reluctantly, and sometimes even under protest, to the conventional and legal uses which their husbands virtually demand of them, and which they are practically forced to submit to! That is a hard saying, but that it is literally true is well known by all who are familiar with the facts.

My own opinion, which is based on widely extended observations and the testimony of a large number of wives who have suffered from this cause, leads me to believe that these unfortunate conditions exist largely through ignorance on the part of both husbands and wives, and that the whole situation might be greatly relieved if these same people could be made wise where now they wholly lack knowledge. It is true, that much of this misery is caused by the carelessness of selfish husbands. Yet, even so, many of these do not mean to be as bad as they really are. They simply don't know, and hence they blunder along.

Truth to tell, a large share of all this trouble comes from the way in which the marriage ceremony teaches both men and women to view their relations as husbands and wives. By the very wording of that document, the parties thereto are virtually declared to obtain certain *rights* which they did not before possess; and because of this fact, they feel that they no longer need to win what they desire, but that they can stand on their rights, and take what they want, whether the party of the second part, on either side, is willing or otherwise! Such action is in accord with both law and custom; and, so entrenched, it continues to effect its injustices, not to say horrors, upon millions of wives, and some husbands, who are the victims of its antiquated ways and means. Let us hope that these things will not always be as they now are! Indeed, even now, wherever affectional sex-expression is in evidence as a mutual factor in married life, none of these evils appear. But, where such righteous conditions exist, the parties thereto have learned to separate the two forms of sex-expression, and they have each of them under complete control. It is because I know that this is so, and that I have seen the beneficent results that have come from such manner of married life, that I believe in it as I do, and that I am anxious to do what I can to bring as many husbands and wives as possible into such a righteous way of living. It is for this reason that I am writing this book.

The time has come, in the lives of all intelligent and wishing-to-do-the-right-thing men and women, when it should be understood that true marriage is not, on the one hand, a legal means of giving free rein to the husband's sex needs or desires; nor is it, on the other hand, an institution whose function it is to secure for the wife social position, or some one who is responsible for her shelter and her board and clothes!

As divinely ordained, the purpose of marriage is two-fold, and each part of its double design is of equal value and moment. It can rightly exist only on a fifty-fifty basis, and everything that can be done, should be done, to bring it to such successful estate. On the one hand, as a biological institution merely, it offers a practical means for the propagation of the human species, a rightful opportunity for the birth and rearing of children. On the other hand, it should be the centre of everything that pertains to the Plus of Humanity as a factor in human progress. The affectional side of human life, as it manifests itself in myriads of ways, should be the chief element in all its out-workings. It should give to the husband and wife an unrestricted opportunity for the mutual expressions of this part of their natures in all its belongings, and the same influence should be in evidence in every part of the household, whose totality is included in the word "home." Truth should be its cornerstone, and love the arch to its doorway. The keystone to love's arch should be courtesy, with justice and kindness for its supporting pillars. All these things are but parts of the Plus of Humanity, and they include everything that makes for human progress, for the well-being of mankind. Mere animals can have no part in the like, but for human souls they are the chief things in life—all that life is really for, so far as its main issues are concerned.

Another proof that affectional sex-expression is no essential element in reproduction, and so, that it has an entity of its own, which is justly entitled to recognition and regard, is the fact that the possibilities of its expression are manifest, in certain ways, in human beings, both male and female, long before and long after reproduction is possible by either of these! Children show signs that they are possessed of this quality, some of them even in babyhood, and all of them who are normal, in the early years of their lives, certainly long before they come to puberty. These manifestations appear in the form of auto-erotic acts which were once held to be abnormal, but which are now recognized as only precocious responses to innate impulses which are to serve most valuable purposes in the mature life of the individual of whose being they are a rightful and most important part. It is true that such early expressions may be too pronounced, in some cases; but, even so, they are to be rightly directed rather than unduly suppressed. Much less should an endeavor be made to annihilate them, or to destroy them, root and branch! Yet such is the treatment that these qualities often receive at the hands of ignorant, even if well-meaning parents. For this cause, multitudes of children and youth, of both sexes, are needlessly frightened nearly to death, and often suffer the tortures of the damned, not only at the hands of their natural guardians, but even still more from their own wrong mental attitudes towards this part of their much-misunderstood, but perfectly wholesome belongings which they have been wrongly taught about. This particular remark may not go to prove the rightful place of affectional sex-expression among married people, but the point I have made was so close at hand that I could not help remarking it. And we all know how much what I have said needs to be said.

But as affectional sex-expression is possible before the age of puberty, even still more remarkable is the fact that it persists, in both men and women, long after the possibilities of reproduction have disappeared. The egg-cell producing period for women rarely exceeds the age of forty-five years;

but the ability for affectional sex-expression, in normal women, often extends to extreme old age. Among men, this item of the limitation of a possible fertilizing period is not as definitely determined as in the case of the cell-producing period among women; but in normal male beings who have not lived abnormal sex-lives, the possibilities of affectional sex-expression remain in equal proportion to the continuation of the rest of their faculties.

Still another proof that affectional sex-expression is no essential part of reproduction is the fact that, in the case of normal women who are pregnant, such manifestation of this part of their natures is not only possible, but, in many cases, it is more in evidence than at any other time in their lives! Such experience is entirely impossible with all other female life-forms, many of whom would fight to the death before they would yield their bodies to a sexual union during the gestation period. Beside this, no male of the lower orders of animal life ever makes any sexual advances whatever towards any female of its kind that is pregnant. All this is a matter of instinct with these life-forms; and, as such, eventuates as it does. But in the human species, among all normal individuals, all this is different. The normal wife is as susceptible to blissful wooing during this part of her life as at any other, and her husband, if he is what he should be, is as much, or more, her gentle wooer then than at any other time in all their married experiences.

And may I be permitted to add that most of the books and "authorities" are against all such affectional sex-expression during the gestation period of wives. And here again, the same old wickedness of making a comparison, or analogy, between human beings and mere animals gets in its shameful work! The argument runs thus:

A: No female animal will submit to sexual experience during the gestation period.

B: Woman is a female animal, and, therefore,

C: No woman should submit to, or permit sexual expression during the gestation period.

This is the same old material syllogism that is used to prove that reproduction is the sole function of sex in the human species, as I have noted in a previous chapter, and it is as wicked as it is untrue! It entirely leaves out, or excludes the supreme fact of The Plus of Humanity as an element of human life, and so sets up as truth that which is really the most stupid, not to say vicious of lies!

The fact is, that affectional sex-expression may reach a height so much above the mere reproductive element, as such, that, in its demonstrations it need not consider at all, or in the least, the more material portion of this in-some-ways dual function of this part of humanity's make-up. Indeed, because of the wrong teachings of the books and "authorities" on this point, thousands of conscientious but misled husbands and wives have suffered needlessly and severely, in body, mind and spirit, through their efforts to suppress or annihilate that which was as natural a longing for expression as was their desire for wholesome food. This is one more place where ignorance of the truth has caused many of the very best of husbands and wives to miss some of the finest and most wholesome experiences of wedded life.

Of course, it goes without saying, that such sex-expression should be *absolutely mutual*, under these conditions. If otherwise, it is not only an abomination, but an outrage that is really a horrible crime, although the statutes do not count it as such, if the parties are legally married! This seems beyond belief, but it is true. Not only so, but the law gives the husband the right to compel the wife to submit to his demands, even when she is thus conditioned! And this in civilized nations!

Perhaps I should add, for the assurance of doubtful readers of the last few paragraphs, that I have based the opinions I have expressed regarding affectional sex-expression during the gestation period, on the testimony of a large number of the best of husbands and wives who have voluntarily and honestly given me the benefit of their own personal experiences in this part of their married lives. And such demonstrations I accept as true, rather than what the books say, or alleged "authorities" prescribe.

Now all of these facts to which I have referred, go to prove that affectional sex-expression is no necessary part of reproduction. They prove that it is an essentially human quality, a something added to the material, or animal, part of man, a Plus of Humanity, whose purpose is something higher than mere materiality, and which, rightly exercised, tends to build up, and bring to its best estate all the noblest qualities in mankind. Animals know nothing of it; it can never be any part of their lives, in any way; and to treat it as if it were a mere animal belonging, or to deny it proper exercise and functioning, is a sin of the most flagrant and damnable sort! As I have said before, and more than once, as well declare cooked food, or books, or music mere animal qualities, and treat these as such, as to endeavor to rule out affectional sex-expression from the lives of husbands and wives.

And if this is so, as so it is, the right thing to do is to make the best possible provision for such expression of the sex-impulse of human beings; and this can only be done by rendering its practice possible without incurring the risk or the chance of involving the element of reproduction! In other words, whenever reproduction enters the realm of sex-expression, conditions should be such, knowledge should be such, that its demonstration should be a matter of *choice* by the parties thereto, an act in which the element of *chance* should be in no way involved.

Of course, in any case where reproduction is the deliberate purpose of sex-expression, the affectional element not only might be present, but it *should* be present, in limitless degree! Such mutual synchronism of the two forms of sex-expression is the very acme of this part of wedded life. The point I wish to make is that such experience should always be under the absolute control of the will, and not a matter of chance, as it now is, for the most part, the world over.

Now, all husbands and wives know that if such a condition of affairs as this could be brought about, it would add many fold to the happiness, the well-being and the mutual satisfaction of their married lives. It would not result in gross debauchery, much less would it bring about licentiousness, or unhealthy, or unrighteous, or unholy living. On the contrary, it would settle nine-tenths of all marital troubles that are now a disgrace to the estate, make happy wives out of those who are now miserable beyond telling, and save thousands of husbands from unwholesome sex-experiences with women other than their wedded wives! And these are all consummations devoutly to be wished.

As things now are, with these two forms of expression of the sex-impulse hopelessly entangled, so that the more subtle and mutually desired one cannot be realized without the *chance* of involving the other, the constant tendency is to inhibit altogether the part which belongs to the Plus of Humanity, and so to rule out of married life possibilities which, rightfully exercised, would result in the highest good of the husband and wife. For, the truth is, beyond all question, not only that a mutually desired exercise of the sex-organs of normal husbands and wives, other than for reproduction, tends to promote everything that is best in their lives, but that such mutual love-exchanges are absolutely essential to their health, happiness and wholesome well-being!

But if, at every sex-meeting, the wife has to take *chances* of becoming pregnant, such fact will always tend to make her reluctant to engage in such exercise; and if she persists in such denial, the possibilities are many to one that she will either alienate her husband's affections, or cause him to lead a dissolute life with other women. It is the universal testimony of the keepers of brothels that a very large part of their patronage comes from married men! And could anything be worse than that? And the cause of this is what I have just stated.

Is it not as clear as daylight that the way to remedy such a deplorable condition of affairs would be to make the item of reproduction on the part of married people a matter of choice rather than one of chance, to make affectional sex-expression possible without involving that of conception? The reasons why this has not been permitted are not far to seek, and I shall recount them in due time.

Nor will it at all serve to preach to married people the doctrine of "don't," to insist that they should live strictly continent lives, and utilize their sex natures only for reproductive purposes. This method has been advocated in certain quarters, all through the ages, but it leads to nothing but constant lying and deception and fraud. Normal men and women will never live such lives as husbands and wives; and it was never intended that they should do so! The added form of sex-expression which came to mankind as a part of the Plus of Humanity was designed for use; and, as such, it should be provided for and made the most of. There is one way to bring about such a result, and that is to make conception in the human family a matter of choice and not one of chance. *Quod erat demonstrandum!*

In the presence of these indisputable facts, two things are clear: First, that the item of reproduction of the human species should be made a matter of special, definite and scientific study, till all the facts pertaining to it are well understood, and thoroughly mastered; and then, when such positive knowledge has been obtained, the same should be placed at the service of all people who are legally entitled to bring children into this world. If you, whoever you are, doubt that this should be done, will you stop your reading, right here, and write out, for yourself, at least, even *one* good and sufficient reason for your denial of the proposition. I will presently give some of the sources from which opposition to such attainment has heretofore come; but that the objections which these parties have so long put forward are either groundless altogether, or that they are now antiquated because of certain changes which have come into existence in social life in recent years, I shall show to the extent of a positive demonstration.

This, then, is the first step to be taken, so far as genuine progress in this item of human attainment is concerned. It goes without saying that, before the second part of this proposition can be realized upon, the laws which now prevent the dissemination of knowledge, thus scientificially obtained, will have to be changed so as to permit such advance; but this is also something that can be done, and that will be done, when the time is fully ripe for its doing. "When the materials are prepared, the architects shall appear! I swear to you, they surely shall appear!" Let us never doubt that this will be so!

There was once a time in the history of the United States when citizens were not only prohibited by law from assisting slaves to obtain their freedom, but they might be legally compelled to help capture such as had escaped, and return them to their masters. Such laws are no longer in evidence; and if they had their little day, and then perished, how much more will it some time be possible to rectify the errors in our present statutes which now obstruct the dissemination of useful and needed knowledge among all our people? The world not only does move, but it *must* move; for so it is ordained in the eternal order of things!

And, concurrently with the discovery of such ways and means for the reproduction of the human species, and the utilization of the knowledge thus obtained, there must be inaugurated a study and development of The Art of Love among all those who marry or are given in marriage. The Art of Love is only another name for the affectional expression of the sex nature as this exists in human beings; and I have more than once shown that all of this belongs to the Plus of Humanity. And whatever belongs to the Plus of Humanity needs to be cultivated and made to grow, and brought to its possible best as such. It cannot be left to the uninstructed guidance of instinct, since instinct can only deal successfully with that part of life which is below the plane of humanity, that is, with mere animality. It has been so left to shift for itself in the past, for the most part, and most of the evils that now hamper and disgrace married life have resulted from this cause. Newly married people have been permitted, are now permitted, not to say forced, to enter this most important of all experiences of their lives, in absolute ignorance of the essential facts which alone can make such relation a success! Both law and social conventions have virtually said: "Let them alone! They will find the way! Nature and instinct are sufficient guides, and these will stand them in stead without help or guidance from any other source! Let them alone!" If there was ever a foolish, wicked and utterly damnable blasphemy devised or uttered by mankind, such is included, to the limit, in the above-quoted words!

As well say to each new generation regarding the cooking of food: "Let the young people alone! They will find the way! Nature and instinct will teach them how, etc." All intelligent people have gotten far enough along in the experiences of life not to say, or even think, these last-quoted words, as they might apply to the cooking of food. But few are they who will dare to do other than to act upon all that is included in the same words as they refer to the married relations of newly-wedded husbands and wives! And yet, the ignorantly-done acts of newly-weds, as these pertain to their most intimate relations, have wrecked more marital happiness than could possibly have come to the same parties from an utter lack of knowledge regarding the cooking of food, or inability to avail themselves of the learning from books or the hearing of music!

We teach our boys how to build and take care of fires made out of wood or coal; but not one word do we vouchsafe to them about the proper and righteous management and control of the fires of passion that often burn in their veins with the most intense fury! The only comment we ever make to them upon such conditions is to preach the doctrine of "don't" to them in their youthful days; and then, when they marry, we give them the legal right to let these long-smothered flames of passion, whose suppression or abnormal burnings may have transformed them into a volcano of ignorant lust, rage with limitless abandon or fury, in a realm where only the most wisely directed, perfectly controlled and skillfully applied warmth or heat should be in evidence! We teach our girls how to come into a room properly, and how to entertain their company, when once they are there; but not one word do we say to them about how to enter the most sacred precincts of married life, or how to care for themselves and their companions in this most complicated of all human relations! We say: "Let them alone! They will find the way! Nature and instinct will teach them, etc." Does it seem possible that such idiotic and wholly abominable conditions should continue to exist among people who claim to be civilized?

As a matter of fact, there have been, and still are, savage tribes which deal better with these basic affairs of life than many civilized peoples do!

Among such, it is often customary for young married people to be initiated into the mysteries of the new experiences of life they have entered upon with the most sacred of ceremonies, and for them to be instructed in marital ways by their elders, who have had experience, the results of which they can transmit to those who come after. Under such conditions, those who start out to travel a road which is new and strange to them, have the benefit of the knowledge of those who have gone over the way before them, and who know its crooks and turns, its dangerous pitfalls and its bottomless bogs!

And is it not strange beyond telling, that, in this most difficult of all ways to travel successfully, the knowledge and the experience of one generation are kept from those who are to come after, and who must make their way, unguided, where they so much need to know what is before them? In all other lines of life, the wisdom which one generation has obtained, indeed, which all previous generations have acquired, is preserved and passed on to those who are to come after. Think of all the cook books which tell how to prepare food for the use of man; or of the printed pages which embody the wisdom of all past years; or of the pictures which artists long dead have left for the living of today to admire and to learn from; or of the music which the geniuses of former days have recorded for the delight of coming generations—think on these things, and then remember how not one word has been left regarding righteous sex-life and rightful sex-living, and the moral of the anomalous fact!

And then think of how little progress could ever have been made in all these lines of life if each individual in each successive generation had been obliged to find out everything pertaining to this or that, all on his own initiative, and without a single hint of help from those who had preceded him! Suppose that every woman who had to prepare food had to find out all about cooking from her own experimentations with the raw material! Or that, in the realm of literature, and art, and music, every one had to make all discoveries unaided by former experiences and records of the same! The very idea of such a condition is almost unthinkable! Under such conditions, human progress would have been impossible through all the years; and after aeons had passed, man would still be the same groping and groveling animal he was at the beginning of his entrance into time and space!

And yet! Such a state of affairs would be no worse than we now have in the sex-lives of millions of people today! From these, all knowledge of past experiences in such life is withheld! All in this part of man's being is left to *instinct!!* What wonder that no progress has been made in this part of man's life under these conditions? Why not leave cooking to instinct, or poetry, or painting, or music or clothes-making, or the cultivation of the soil, or bridge-building, or road-making, or a thousand-and-one of the arts of living which have done so much for the progress of the human race—why not leave all these to *instinct?* Why not say of the on-comers of each generation, regarding all these things: "Let them alone! They will find the way! Their instincts will be a sufficient guide. Let them alone!"

Good people! Could there be a worse blasphemy than that? Could there be a greater sin against everything that could be sinned against, than that? And yet—brethren and sisters, let us think on these things, and then let us try our best to make these worst of all conditions better than they now are. For of such is the kingdom of heaven.

What all human beings must come to understand is that the Art of Love is one of the most important of all the arts that have ever been devised for man to acquire; and that the Science of Procreation is one of the most vital that has ever been placed within the possibility of man's attainment. Not only are both of these things true, but it is equally certain that the first of them, namely, The Art of Love, is the most puzzling and subtle of all arts to attain in perfection, and that The Science of Procreation in the human family is the most difficult of all scientific problems to solve. And yet, for the most part, so far in the history of the race, both of these most vital issues of human life have been left to the guidance of *instinct* alone, a faculty which belongs to lower forms of life, and which serves their purposes well, but which has little or no value whatever in meeting and supplying the needs of humanity in any of the realms where the Plus of Humanity is in evidence. The Art of Love, and the Science of Procreation as it applies to human beings, belong entirely to that part of man which I have named The Plus of Humanity. And everything that falls within that sphere needs study and cultivation and mastery and wise and intelligent application if progress is to be secured.

To this end, all young people should be carefully taught and wisely instructed in both the Art of Love and the Science of Procreation before they ever be permitted to enter the sacred realm of marriage. We require the teacher, the doctor, the clergyman, etc., to present a diploma which vouches for their fitness in the callings they are about to enter, before we permit them to take their places in the communities upon whose inhabitants they would practice! And yet, we legally prohibit young people from acquiring even an elementary knowledge of themselves or of their mates, so far as sex is concerned, before they enter upon the sex-relations which form the chief item of difference between married life and that of mere comradeship! As a matter of fact, far less misery would result to humanity if quack doctors and snide lawyers and ignorant preachers were turned loose, galore, in all our communities, everywhere, than now comes to society as a whole, and to individuals in particular, from permitting young people to marry ignorantly, as they must do under present conditions! There is not a doubt in the world about the truth of this statement, and we all know it. And yet——

What we must do is, first, make a careful and detailed record in books, of all the sex knowledge of husbands and wives which has so far been attained by their experiences and experimentations, and to add to this such new discoveries along sex lines as may be made by the most careful study and most searching investigations of the wisest men and women in all the world who will devote their lives to such work. That is the first thing to be done to better the present situation. The second is, to disseminate the knowledge thus obtained so that it may be available to all the sons and daughters of men who enter the married state. To this end both the Art of Love and the Science of Procreation should be taught by the ablest of teachers, wise and skillful men and women, who should thus transmit to those who come after, the wisdom and knowledge of those who have gone before. We do this in all other lines of life! Can any sane person give even one good and sufficient reason why we should not pursue the same course in the realm of sex knowledge? On the contrary, does not every condition that we are now surrounded by, demand that we should deal with this part of human life as we do with all the others that confront us? There can be but one sane answer to this question. And it will be answered as it should be, some day, some time!

As already said, before these things can be done, the legal barriers against such doing must be removed, but even this can be done. Because it should be done, it can be done; and because it can be done, it will be done. For such is the eternal order of things.

Now, I am well aware that to some, perhaps to many, of my readers, what I have just outlined may seem only an "irridescent dream." They may think, and even say: "It can never be. It is too much to even hope for. Human nature is human nature. Man was born to demand, and woman was born to submit. It has always been so, and it will always be so. Better let well enough alone. If you go to 'meddling with nature's ways,' you are bound to get into trouble. Of course some husbands fail to make their wives happy, and some wives fail to make their husbands happy; but that is their personal affair. They made their bed, let them lie in it, as the old saying goes. You can't eliminate misery from this world, and what's the use of trying to do the impossible? Besides that, you can't teach people about these things. They won't stand for it, and the law forbids it. Better leave things as they are. Let nature work it out. If it is to be, it will be, so what's the use of bothering!"

Well, I don't know as it is much use to try to convince those who say these things. As Whitman says: "Logic and argument never convince." Still, it is certain that the world has progressed much along lines of life where advance at times seemed impossible; and from such facts I gain courage to hope that better things may be in store for humanity, in days to come, along the lines on which I am writing. I remember that it was nearly two centuries after the discovery was made that the earth is round before the fact was accepted by the "highest authorities"; and that, though nineteen hundred years have passed since the Founder of Christianity lived, the eternal principles of righteousness which He taught are still but partly understood and accepted. Truly, we have to learn to "patiently wait for outcomes," but meantime, we will do what we can to make good better, and to help the better always to move toward the best.

And even as I write, there comes to me a sign of the times that makes for what I have a long while been looking for. This is a book by Dr. H. W. Long, entitled "Sane Sex Life and Sane Sex Living," * and the careful reading I have given it proves that it is just what its title declares it to be. The author of the book is a physician who has evidently

---

* Richard G. Badger, The Gorham Press, Boston, Mass.

studied long, intelligently and well the sex-problems that his married patients have encountered, and concerning which they have sought his counsel and advice; and the book he has written is a compendium of what he has said to them, all and several, as the years have gone by. What he has said in this book is only putting into written words the wholesome information and thoroughly scientific knowledge which his patrons did not possess, and for lack of which they suffered all sorts of marital woes and distresses. In a sort of fatherly way, and speaking rather as a loving and sympathetic counselor than as a coldly-scientific practitioner, he has told just what his people wanted to know, and just what they needed to know in order to make married life a success. To the newly wedded his teachings were a revelation, a clear light to guide untutored feet over what was to them an unknown way. And to the married people who had been made unhappy through ignorance of their sex-natures, his words imparted such knowledge as they needed to enable them to succeed where they had so far failed. And, after some years of most successful work in the naturally limited field of his personal practice, he was induced, by some who knew of what he had done, to print what he began by giving only vocal utterance to, and in this way to widely extend his teachings which had heretofore been quite circumscribed. But

—and here comes in the same old legal hindrance which I have before referred to—under present United States' laws, the book can be "sold only to members of recognized professions," and so it cannot, as yet, reach the multitudes of married people who would be immeasurably benefited by the information it contains. The pity of it! The book is wholly unlike any other of a similar sort that I have ever read, or that I know anything about; and, though necessarily hampered by the present restrictions upon its general circulation, I am sure the professional men and women who are legally permitted to own it, will pass on to their constituents the valuable knowledge it contains.

Need I say that my reason for mentioning this book as I have is not for "advertising purposes," but only to give proof of the statement I have made that it is possible to teach these delicate matters in a way that is at once wholesome and easily understood, and which results in untold benefit to the husbands and wives who can avail themselves of such teaching. Dr. Long's experiences, which he outlines in the preface to his book, demonstrate to a finish the realization of such a possibility, and that is the "sign of the times" which caused me to say what I have about it. The time will come when not only this book, but many others like it, will be within the reach of even the rank and file, and with this coming there will also come wise and sympathetic teachers who will expound to eager learners, the truths which such books contain.

May I add, that Dr. Long's book is utterly unlike any book on the subject of sex that I know about, in that it has not a single word to say about "venereal diseases," a subject which usually occupies a large portion of the pages of such books, sometimes quite to the limits of boredom, not to say disgust. And this also is a noteworthy step forward in the line of this sort of literature. Speed the day, not only when this book can go to the people, but others, such as I have suggested, along with it. Under the guidance of such instruction as such books and teachers can give, at least something of what we all hope for may become possible to a degree at least; and such progress being made, more is sure to follow, until, in due time, the reproduction of the human species shall come wholly under the control of the human will, and all children which are then born into this world shall come into being by choice and not by chance.

Concurrent with this new order of things, will be the ability of husbands and wives to respond to their affectional sex-impulses, throughout all the lines of their varied modes of expression; to cultivate and bring to full realization the part of their sex-nature which lies wholly within the realm of the Plus of Humanity. Such results may be slow in coming, and long in arriving, but the *desire* of all husbands and wives goes out toward such conditions in married life; their *imaginations* picture such new order of things, and, some day, the *ingenuity* of some divinely inspired genius, or geniuses, will find the way to realize the hope of these noblest of all the men and women in all the world, the fathers and mothers of generations yet to be! So may it be!

CHAPTER XII

SOME RESULTS THAT WOULD PROBABLY FOLLOW SUCH A NEW ORDER OF THINGS IN MARRIED LIFE

Beyond question, the first, and perhaps the most welcome, and in some respects the most important of all the results that would follow from such new order of things in married life as I have just depicted, would be the immeasurable relief that would come to husbands and wives (especially wives) as they felt themselves freed from the caprices of chance which are now so largely in evidence in marital relations, and within the sure realm of certainty as to results that would come only from their own deliberate choosing! The burden of care and anxiety which would thus be lifted from the shoulders of the married portion of mankind is beyond the possibility of estimation.

And here is another place where statistics need not be called upon to verify the truth of a statement made. "Only what everybody knows is so, is so," says the Good Gray Poet; and his words were never so applicable as they are in this item of the doubt, uncertainty and dread which continually obtain in the lives of all intelligent husbands and wives who honestly wish to wisely order all the affairs of their lives so that they may be sure of the results which are to follow their acts.

And this does not at all mean that husbands and wives would give themselves up to all sorts of extravagant sexual indulgences if once they were made masters of the principles and practice of birth control which, under the present order of things, they are practically unable to attain to. On the contrary, all my investigations have tended to establish the fact that where both forms of sex-expression are fully within the intelligent control of the husband and wife, a temperate exercise of these qualities invariably results.

And it is most natural that this should be so, according to the principle that perfect satisfaction in any of the experiences of life leads directly to the most wholesome ways of living. It is the unsatisfied, and so the restless, who indulge in excesses or debauchery! It is very seldom that one who happily sits at a well-spread table and there regularly eats his meals of well-cooked food, which fully meets the needs of his physical appetite, both as to his material make-up and the Plus of his humanity—it is very seldom that such a man becomes a drunkard or a glutton, or the victim of a disordered digestion which may come from either too little or too much eating! And when the absolute mutuality of two parties is necessary for perfect satisfaction, and this is constantly unrealized, then is the liability to excess, or unnaturalness, or unwholesomeness greatly increased.

And the well-known fact is, that where the wife, from fear of possible chance results, always hesitates and often refuses to meet the advances of her husband, both the parties, and especially the husband, are constantly left unsatisfied; and it is such unsatisfaction which leads to all sorts of the most unwholesome, and not infrequently shameful practices on the part of those who are thus circumstanced.

Under these conditions, this part of married life is a source of constant disagreement between multitudes of husbands and wives, a state of affairs which leads to habitual unrest, and not infrequently to continuous quarrels, than which nothing could be worse. Where married people live in this way (and multitudes do, as we all know) love soon departs never to return, and a hollow mockery is all that remains of what might have been, under other and rightful conditions, a union of "two souls with but a single thought, two hearts that beat as one"! But such a happy attainment as this can never be reached when there is a constant difference between the parties concerned, where one is continually proposing and the other perpetually opposing an expression of life which, in its rightful exercise, is as natural, as wholesome and as upbuilding to all that is best in mankind as is breathing.

Another result that would probably follow from putting into the hands of husband and wives the definite possibility of determining by choice the number of children they would have, would be a lessening of the number of children born into this world. On this point I shall have more to say in a later chapter; but a few words about it, just here.

It is held by those who oppose "birth control" in any form, that such a condition of affairs would result in "race suicide"; but those who thus assert, or who profess to believe such doctrine, fail to take into account certain basic facts which are inherent in human nature, while at the same time they neglect, or refuse to state, their real reasons for this opposition to what they inveigh against.

The item in the count which they overlook is the natural desire for children which is deeply implanted in the innermost make-up of all normal human beings! Doubtless it is true that, in some highly sophisticated or abnormal specimens of mankind, both male and female, the desire for progeny has atrophied or in some unfortunate way been lost. But, take human beings, as a whole, the one chief desire of life is to perpetuate their kind, to have children of their own, and not physical hunger for food itself has a firmer grip on their actions or their hopes! We see this clearly in the case of all normal women, but among men the fact is not so openly in evidence. But in a final analysis, in a crucial test, the fact appears that normal men are as desirous of parenthood as are their natural counterparts! Mr. Bernard Shaw has made this the motive of his immortal play, "Man and Superman," and he brings the real situation to a powerful climax when his hero, Jack Tanner, throws all the ambitions of his life to the winds, if needs be, in order that he may obtain parenthood; and he makes him say, as he takes Ann in his arms: "Is there a father's heart as well as a mother's?" There is but one truthful answer to his question, and that is a universal one! Mr. Shaw's chief character responds to it in the affirmative, as the body, mind and soul of every normal man in all the world inspire him to do! So much for normal men; and as for normal women, their natural desire for motherhood is the chief element of their lives. We all know that this is so, and "what everybody knows is so, is so"!

I have a friend who is a more-than-once millionaire. I have known him from boyhood, and have seen him grow from comparative poverty to the possession of great wealth. As his fortune was a-making, he married a beautiful woman, and for a number of years he and his wife have been very prominent in the social life of the city in which they live. But they have never had any children! I was talking with him, not long ago, and congratulating him on his remarkable success in the business world; but I added that I had only one thing against him, and that was, that he had no children. I had no idea that I so seriously wounded him by my remark; but he turned from me for a moment and was silent. And when he faced me again there were tears in his eyes, "strong business man" as everybody counted him to be, and he said: "Don't blame me! Somehow that was not to be for wife and me! But we would be willing to give, right now, the half of all the fortune we possess, and then some, for just one baby that was really truly all our own!" Yea, verily! There is a father's heart in man as well as a mother's heart in woman, and this great passion of humanity will be realized upon by both, in the long run, in the vast majority of cases, come what may! The only point I urge is, that it will be far the better for all parties concerned, that such supreme consummation of all human realizations should be a matter of deliberate choice rather than a freak of chance. And can any sane soul say nay to that?

Of course, there will be those who, under these conditions, will deliberately remain childless; but is it not best that these should be that way? As a rule people who do not want children are not fit to bring them up; and people who are not fit to bring children up, ought not to have them! The crying evil in this whole affair, as it now exists, is that many people who do not want children *chance* to have them, and that the children that they bring into the world are obliged to grow up under conditions that are as unpropitious for their successful rearing as could possibly be. My belief is that these things would be much less frequent than they now are if all children who are born could come into being by choice rather than by *chance!* Do *you* doubt it?

But, beyond all this, it is quite certain that many people who desire to have children, would, under the order of things I have proposed, have fewer than they do now. The reasons for this are many, and not far to seek. First, under our present economic conditions, people who are too poor to properly support a large family would not be obliged to have a large family to support. This, and still they would not be deprived of affectional sex-expression which, wholesomely exercised, so much inures to their well-being, and which, with chance as one of its factors, they would have to inhibit if they kept the number of their offspring within reasonable limits.

Again, with only as many children in the family as they could fairly well provide for, parents could take such care of these as their well-being required, and in this way give them a start in life which would lead them to be better citizens when they were grown than they would have been if reared in poverty. This, as regards both the bodies and the minds of what children they had. They could feed and clothe their progeny in at least wholesome comfort, and they could give them such an education as it befits an intelligent human being to have. They would not be obliged to put their children to work till they were able to do the tasks assigned them without detriment to their health or their morals, and in this way their offspring would have far better opportunity to grow into normal men and women than they would have under less propitious conditions.

Besides this, what children were born would undoubtedly be stronger and healthier when they came into being than they would be if they were, each of them, one of too many for a mother to bear. For, while it is certainly true that there are now and then women who can bear a large number of children successfully, yet such are exceptions, and over and against them are crowds of mothers who are practically forced to give birth to more babies than they can give good bodies to, and many of whose poorly pre-natally nourished children perish in infancy, or, if they live to grow up, suffer all through what lives they do live because of the poor start in life they received from their mother.

And this means that, with fewer children born, and with what are born well cared for, the death-rate of infants would be far lower than it has ever been; and because of this fact, the danger of "race suicide" would be far from as threatening as some who now raise this note of alarm declare it would be. Not the quantity of children born, but the quality of those who come into this world would then be a realizable mode of human reproduction and rearing.

Again, if the sure control of the begetting of children were placed in the hands of married people, it would, at one blow, wipe out the crime of abortion which is now so rampant in modern civilized life. I need not enlarge on this point, for all well-posted people know what the situation in this regard at present really is. Of course, here is another place where statistics not only need not, but cannot be brought into evidence. In the very nature of things, statistics are not procurable in this life and death affair. But, especially if you live in a city, and the larger the city, the more frequent the crime, you, of your own knowledge, know cases and cases where married women who have started on the road to motherhood are relieved from the necessity of traveling the full length of that way by a means which is practically murder.

Mind, what I am now talking about is really the taking of a life which has actually been entered upon, and this is a condition of affairs which is wholly different from rendering inefficient the elements which might cause such life to be begun! I have referred to this before, but I mention it again to emphasize the real difference between the two acts, and to show how much more righteous and wholesome the one way is than the other. As a rule abortion, especially if frequently indulged in, results in the ruin of the physical health of the woman upon whom it is practiced, and it is as harmful to her mental and spiritual being as it is to her more material constitution, and besides this, the life of a human being has been taken whenever abortion is practiced. But with the chief cause of this practice eliminated, the abomination itself would perish from off the face of the earth. And to have this unspeakable evil thus removed would be an attainment in the line of practical virtue which is beyond the power of words to describe.

But, some one may say, if a sure means of birth control were actually discovered, and such knowledge were generally disseminated would not the unmarried secure such information and practice upon it; and, in this way, might not all sorts of licentiousness outside of wedlock become current? In reply to this I can only say, that what I am writing, so far in this treatise, deals only with married people; and what might happen outside that relation is not within the compass of the present discussion, surely not at this point of the argument. All the good things in this world are liable to abuse; but we cannot act on the principle that, because a good thing may possibly be abused, therefore it must never have a being, or must be abolished if it come into existence! The current of electricity which lights the lamp by which I can see to write these words would kill me if it passed through my body; but means are provided by which it can pass through the incandescent bulb and give me needed light, while I sit by, not only unharmed, but benefited by its beneficent rays. The comparison between this illustration and the supposition just suggested is too obvious to need further consideration, though I may refer to it again, later on.

Another result that would come from the establishment of the possibility of certain birth control on the part of husbands and wives, would be the marriage of multitudes of people who now remain single because they are unwilling to enter upon a condition of living where there is a constant possibility of parenthood. Under present economic conditions, there are millions of young people who are so conditioned financially, that they dare not assume the responsibilities and burdens which necessarily come to fathers and mothers. These bear no children now, and even if they married and were childless, conditions would be no worse than they now are, so far as the danger of race suicide is concerned, or as the lack of increase in population is involved! The only difference between the two situations would be that, if these people could marry, and so have the legal right to give mutual expression to the affectional side of their sex-natures, to that part of their being which is so great an element in the plus of humanity, they would be far better conditioned than they now are, when they are compelled to attempt to wholly inhibit this part of their God-bestowed faculties; or else, if they give the same expression at all, they are forced to do so clandestinely or under the most unwholesome of circumstances! And can there be any doubt as to which of these two ways is the better?

I wish I had space, just here, to make an exhaustive statement of how it has come about that it is currently taught that it is wrong to give expression to the affectional element in human sex-nature unless the same ultimates in reproduction. It is a long story, far too long to be told in its entirety in a book of the size of the one I am now writing. But the chief reasons why these things are as they now are may be briefly stated, as follows: The first of these is summed up in the word asceticism, a theory of life which makes wrong anything and everything which human beings really enjoy or delight in. And the second is, the analogy that is drawn between mankind and the animals below this highest form of life expression. The ascetics, both men and women, for some reason, came to be accounted as "holy" human beings, far better than the rest of mankind; and, as such, they were held up as examples to be imitated and emulated. And because the chief article in their creed has always been to "mortify the flesh," and the sex part of man's being was counted by them as the most fleshly of all their make-up, for this reason they claimed to totally inhibit this part of their being and live absolutely continent lives. However, as it was necessary to have somebody to provide food and drink for these sanctified ones, they consented to the exercise of the sex faculty, *on the part of others*, for reproductive purposes, but for that alone, and all else was sin! So much for that phase of the situation. And as for the animal analogy, it was claimed that the animals never indulged in affectional sex-expression; and, man being an animal, he should abide by the same law, and live life through in like manner as did these lower forms of vital existence. And that is the next chapter in the long story of how a natural and wholesome part of the Plus of Humanity was inhibited, became anathema! I have said all this before, but it needs saying more than once, hence this repeat.

Added to all this was a rank form of jealousy which had its roots in supreme selfishness, the details of which are too subtle to be considered here. But the greatest error of all came from failing to recognize the existence of the Plus of Humanity as the chief factor in the make-up of mankind as such, and of not realizing that affectional sex-expression is as rightful a part of such quality as is cooked food for the palate and stomach, or reading for the eyes, or music for the ears of man! For all these reasons, sex-functioning, for other than reproductive purposes, came to be considered as wrong; and by the same token, it is still thought of as wrong by vast numbers of people who, while holding to this theory, practice the very reverse of what they claim to believe! The pity of it!

But I hope I have shown in the earlier chapters of this book, that affectional sex-expression is not only a rightful form of marital experience, but that it is a manner of living which is productive of the highest and best, physically, mentally and spiritually, that husbands and wives can possibly attain to.

Under these circumstances, what could be better than to give to all people who are eligible to married life such knowledge as would enable them to live wholesome and healthful lives in this part of their being, even if their circumstances were such that, for good and sufficient reasons, it was not best that they should bring children into the world? Surely, it is something greatly to be desired that all married people who are properly circumstanced to rear a family should do so; but to totally deprive such as are not so conditioned of all the other joys of married life is to do a wicked thing, and to set up an abnormal condition of affairs which results in a host of the most pronounced evils.

And this leads to the remark that such enabling people to marry even if they did not have children would practically destroy prostitution as it now exists! This vice of vices, which has existed throughout all the ages, in spite of all efforts to exterminate it, and which has been the cause of unutterable woe and misery, and disease and death, to millions of human beings of both sexes, exists, almost entirely, because of the abnormal marital conditions which are forced upon the human race which practically keep great multitudes of people from living normal sex lives. If the item of certain birth control were within the possession of all husbands and wives, not only would there be millions more of husbands and wives than there now are, but the great majority of these would live lives of such mutual agreement that commercial sex exploitation would be largely, if not wholly, extirpated from civilized life!

And with the passing of this abomination of commercial sex-indulgence, there would also go a horde of sex-abnormalities which now exist among human beings of both sexes, and which come, chiefly, from the fact that those who practice these forms of sex-expression are deprived of a wholesome exercise of what is really a basic element of normal human nature. For the most part, in days gone by and up to the present time, the treatment of all these errancies from the ways of right sex-living, has been chiefly in the line of attempted suppression of the sex-impulse altogether, or of such negative dealing with them as tended rather to the intensifying than the remedying of the evils they were set to eliminate. But gradually wise and well-posted men and women are coming to see that an undue suppression of a natural impulse tends fully as much, and sometimes more, toward producing unwholesome results than does even excess of functioning on the part of the organs whose action it is attempted to inhibit! What needs to be done, in all these cases, is to find out what is really a righteous manner of expression for all the organs of the human body, with the factors of the Plus of Humanity constantly in evidence, and then to establish such conditions that all men and women can live in harmony with the same. And the doctrine of "don't," and a negative policy in these premises, will never produce these greatly-to-be-desired results. Such will only arrive as the outcome of the most intense scientific investigation, long pursued and most eagerly and intelligently sought for, and which knowledge, once attained, shall be universally disseminated among all the sons and daughters of men, and righteously utilized by them! Such attainment cannot be easily reached, nor will it be speedy in its coming; but that it will some day be a reality is as certain as the progress of the race is sure.

Another, and a similar, gain in this direction will be that this new order of marital living will make it possible for persons who never ought to bring children into the world, to marry, and to live normal sex-lives on the affectional side of their being. This would include all those who are the victims of hereditary taints which ought not to be transmitted to future generations. There are many such men and women, and it is not now infrequent that these marry and, by chance, have children who ought never to have been born, who suffer all their lives because of the sins of their ancestors and who eventually fill untimely graves. None of these happenings need be, under the order of things I have outlined, and with the item of birth control fully mastered by these married, but never-ought-to-be parents. And that would be a great step forward, for the well-being of the oncoming generations.

In all that I have said on this point, I have made no mention of the pronounced abnormally-sexed human beings who sometimes appear in this world; nor is there need that I do so. The normal life of normal men and women is not to be determined, or gauged, or limited, or exploited, one way or another, because of the abnormal specimens of the human species which now and then appear upon the face of the earth. It is enough that it be determined what is right and wholesome for those who are at least somewhere near an average standard of human beings, and to make it possible for them to live as their best interests, physical, mental and spiritual demand that they should live. To such a realization the *desires* of all sane men and women hopefully go out, their *imaginations* picture for them what life would be under such righteous conditions, and it only remains for the *ingenuity* of inspired souls, lighted by wisdom from on high, to discover and to disseminate a knowledge which will bring about such now merely ideal results.

CHAPTER XIII

OBJECTORS AND OBJECTIONS, AND SOME ANSWERS TO BOTH

THERE are three classes of people who have always been objectors to any form of birth control, and who have always opposed any measures which would enable parents to have children by *choice* rather than by *chance*. These are, first, the war leaders; second, the church leaders; and, third, the leaders in the commercial world who have wanted cheap labor. There are reasons why these people have thought and done as they have, and it will be well to study these somewhat in detail, in the order in which they have arisen, and find out the motives upon which their beliefs and their acts have been based.

In doing this, it is but fair to say that the presence of such people in the world is not at all unnatural, nor are the things they have done to be wondered at, when all the facts are taken into account. Indeed, most of the things in this world that are at first called unnatural may more truthfully be called perfectly natural when the whole story of their existence is known. As Mr. Charles Dickens remarks: "It might be well to stop, now and then, and consider if, in many cases, it is not natural to be unnatural!" Many of man's acts, when squared by the rules of righteousness, are most unnatural; but when measured by the causes which have produced them, they are as natural as that water should run down hill! They couldn't help being what they are, the source of their origin being what it was.

According to this principle, it was, first, perfectly natural that there should be war leaders among all the primitive peoples of the earth. This condition began in the earliest history of the race, or just as soon as races of men began to be. Just as soon as families began to group themselves into tribes, and tribes began to have interests which were hostile, one to another; and just so soon as they began to maintain their interests, which they usually called their rights, against those who would deprive them of the same, just so soon war came into being, and with its advent came the leaders and conductors of human strife. And because, in all the earlier wars in which mankind engaged, the probabilities of victory were always in favor of those who had the greatest number of warriors in the field, for this reason the war leaders of those days were always anxious to have as many fighting men as possible subject to their call and command.

And so it was perfectly natural that all these most prominent men, in every tribe, should be ambitious to have as many prospective warriors as possible born, in order that their armies might be continually well supplied with fighting material. And because female human beings were needful in order that male human beings might be born, for this reason the war lords tolerated the birth of girl babies, and took care that they should be made fit to breed at as early a period in life as possible, and kept breeding to the limit of their possibilities. For these reasons they used every means within their power to keep the birth rate as high as possible, and they opposed any and all means or measures which would lower, or which threatened to lower the same. That is the early history of the opposition to birth control on the part of the war chiefs, or leaders, in those far days.

And what thus came into being and was thoroughly established among the tribes of earth grew to more and more as these tribes were grouped into communities, and communities into states, and states into nations. In all these social aggregations, the fundamental principle of those getting together was "us and ours"; and to make such a combination that what they had could not be taken from them, while they were able to take from those who were weaker than they were, anything that they happened to want. To do these things required armies, and armies were composed of men. And the larger the social aggregation, the bigger the state or the nation, the larger the army which was required to maintain the same. And as soldiers could only be made out of "boys grown tall," the one chief desire of those who commanded soldiers was to have as many small boys born as possible, out of which to make tall boys in due course of time. To secure such results, these military leaders in all nations, in all times, have done all in their power to stimulate in every possible way the rapid reproduction of the human species throughout all the realms in which their influence could be exercised or felt.

This they have done both positively and negatively. They have made marriage easy and divorce hard, and they have always appealed to the pride and the alleged patriotism of their constituents in the matter of bringing children into the world. To such extent have these leaders carried this militaristic idea into the item of reproduction, that, everywhere, mothers, even to this day, are prouder to bear boy babies than they are to bring girl babies into the world, and even in the Bible it is written: "She no longer remembereth her sorrow, for joy that a *man* child is born." No other single fact could show how deep-seated an influence militarism has succeeded in imposing upon all classes of human beings as does this one which I have here referred to. (It is curious the ways in which many of the things in which we take so much pride, really came into being!)

Added to this, these same military leaders have appealed to the vanity and love of show of parents of both sexes, by surrounding themselves and their troops with all the trappings and the suits of pomp and circumstance. Dazzling paraphernalia, shining helmets and swords and glittering arms of all sorts are in evidence wherever soldiers are. Medals of honor gleam on stalwart breasts, and flags and banners gay are flung to every breeze on land and sea when men in arms appear. And stirring music sounds, and drums are beaten and bugles blown till the blood of all who hear fairly leaps in their veins!

And the fathers and mothers of those men in arms look with pride upon their sons in the ranks, and rejoice that they have been instrumental in providing the essentials of these serried columns! 'Tis they who have borne these lusty lads who go forth under mighty leaders to fight for country, home and God! And, being thus appealed to, these husbands and wives of the rank and file delight to bring male children into the world, the more the better; and they will also be resigned when female children are born to them, because these may be the means of more male children being born, in due course of time.

Such is the positive part of what militarism has done to insure the constant filling up of their needed ranks; and, negatively, the same men who foster and keep alive these propaganda most strenuously oppose any and every means or method which would tend to reduce the birth rate, especially among the rank and file. The consequence is that, being thus antagonized by the most powerful and influential men in all countries, in all times, the science of bringing children into this world by the deliberate choice of their parents has been so handicapped that it has never been even carefully studied, and much less have attempts been made to put into practice what little has been discovered and become known on the subject. There has been no stimulus toward investigation in this field of possible scientific discovery, and laws have been made to prohibit the dissemination of whatever knowledge on this subject any one might possess. Such is at least a part of the record of what militarism has done in the line of keeping the long-established reproductive situation in the human family what it has been and now is.

Nor should militarism be too much blamed for its acts in the past or present. Things being as they are, this factor in social life could scarcely do otherwise than as has been done! So long as force of arms remains the chief, if not the sole means of maintaining national supremacy, or existence, even, such resource must be exploited, at least to the limit which necessity requires. And so, both the logic of the situation and the demands of the same, have practically compelled these things to be as they have been and are; and so long as these remain as they always have been, and are, just so long will the military factor of the state or nation have to stand opposed to any means or methods which would reduce the supply of soldiers to carry out their commands. With this point so far demonstrated, let it rest thus for the present.

The second group of opponents to child begetting and birth by choice rather than by chance, is, and long has been, composed of church leaders, who have been as powerful, in their way, in their hostility to the introduction of this principle and practice as have been the military leaders already referred to. And the opposition which these have offered has been intrenched on practically the same grounds which militarism has based its hostility upon. The church has needed followers and supporters as the army has needed soldiers. These, not to fight or shed blood, but to furnish the needed wherewithal to exploit and maintain the institutions of which church leaders were at the head.

And this also is natural! Religion is a normal part of the human make-up, and to organize and maintain religious institutions is a legitimate part of social life. But here, as well as in some other practices of gregarious life, it might be truthfully written: "The zeal of thine house hath eaten thee up!" And so it came about that, in many cases, church leaders came to feel that they and their work and their institutions were the most important affairs in all the world, and that they should, all of them, be set up and cared for accordingly. And to care for and support the religious leaders that came to be, and the institutions they established, soon required great sums of money for their carrying-on, and to raise and keep on raising great sums of money for this purpose, required great numbers of men and women to do what was counted as needful to be done. And so these leaders were anxious for large followings, and large followings meant large families, and there we are again!

To be sure, these advocates of the largest possible number of births in all families were not as anxious about the sex of those born as were the military leaders. They could utilize women as well as men in their work, sometimes better. But they all wanted plenty of children of both sexes in their flocks, and they proceeded to do all in their power to produce such results.

Their method of procedure in the premises was quite different from that of the militarists; it was much more subtle and gripping, as it were, and it all came to the same in the long run. They did not appeal so much to the natural selfishness which was inherent in the make-up of their followers, but they exploited the reproductive element of their constituents in another and a more effective way. They made marriage a most sacred, rather than a merely legal or civil institution; and they introduced the idea that, once solemnized, its permanence was to be measured not only by time, but by all eternity!

Under these conditions, marriage once entered upon could never be escaped from, and hence all its hardships had to be endured, all its wrongs put up with, and all the time the *chance* of bringing children into the world was continually in evidence. Added to all this, these leaders of the religious element in their followers taught that to use any means to prevent conception was a crime because the germs, whose union would result in pregnancy, were alive, and to render them ineffective was nothing less than murder, and the punishment of murder was endless suffering in a lake of fire and brimstone!

It is not pleasant to write these things, but that what I have stated is only the plain truth is a matter of common knowledge among all well-posted people. And that this pressure was put upon millions of people for many, many years, is a matter of history which all who will do so may read. And it is further true that the same practically compulsory force is still exercised in many quarters, even to this day, and with the same results that it has always produced.

Nor need harsh words be used in condemning those who inaugurated and made efficient the means and methods which have just been noted for securing the birth of great numbers of children. The men and women who expolited these ways and means also acted naturally, all things being taken into their account. They were ostensibly not selfish in doing as they did; surely not so, as they translated and gave reasons for their doings. On the contrary, as they interpreted their deeds, they were all of the highest nature, not only for the well-being of their flocks while they lived in this world, but for their certain happiness and delectation in a world yet to come.

Nor need the honesty of these church leaders be impugned, at least that of the great majority of them. They may not have been right in their beliefs and teachings on these points, but, even so, that they were sincere in their errors it is at least charitable to hold.

And the results of these teachings regarding birth control have been inestimable! It is only a very few days since I heard a woman who is a disciple of such leadership say, to a large number of women who came to hear her talk: "It is the duty of every wife to bear as many children as possible. We can never have too many babies born. My grandfather had twenty-four, and that was none too many!" She did not say how many wives the old gentleman had to bear these double dozen of progeny, but from her zeal in saying what she did, it seemed to me she would have fully indorsed the teaching of the old worthy who is reported to have said: "If a woman die from child-bearing, let her go to it. It is for such purpose she was born, and she has no cause to complain if it requires her life to fulfill her duty!" But let us not too much blame even those who would carry their philosophy and their theories to such extremes. Theirs is only another instance of zeal which has eaten up its devotees.

And it is only just to give these credit for all the good they have done, as well as to charge to their account the wrongs and evils they have inflicted upon mankind by their teachings and their deeds. The wonderful temples they have caused to be built, the hospitals they have been instrumental in establishing, and the institutions of learning they have set up, all these have been worthful, for the most part, and they should be so reckoned. It has needed money, plenty of it, and always more, to do these things. And, as the economical world has always been, it has always required an unlimited number of common, every-day workers, to produce the money needed to exploit all these institutions which the church has, so far, been the chief factor in originating and carrying on. Hence, honor to whom honor is due. However, nothing is permanent in this world, and progress is the law of all life; and it is worth while to consider the former and the present conditions just referred to, and to ask if what has always been in these particulars must always be, or if there are better things in store in these matters in the days that are before us. And this we will do, later on. Meantime, it is only fair to note the fact that, up to date, the great church leaders have been objectors to the principle and practice of birth control, and have always favored the method of bringing children into this world by chance rather than by choice. It should be remembered too, what a tremendous influence the church has had in these matters. The religious nature is one of the strongest in all the furnishings that humanity possesses, and a strong appeal to this part of man's being is most potent in the results it produces. So the fact stands that the church leaders have had a very great influence in preventing the reproduction of the human species by choice rather than by chance. And that point is all that need be made at this stage of the argument.

The third class of objectors to any restrictions being placed upon the reproduction of the human species, has long been composed of the exploiters of human labor. In the nature of things, these objectors come last in the series I have mentioned, from the fact that the necessity of war began as far back as the tribal life of mankind, and the religious element in man appeared very early in the history of the race. But when social life became so far developed that it became possible to concentrate labor, for various purposes, then came the desire to have an ample supply of this commodity; and hence to have the birth of children as numerous as possible.

This utilization of the labor of others than one's self took two forms; first, that of human slavery, and, second, of work for wages; but, in both cases, it was for the interests of the exploiters of labor to have a plentiful supply of those who worked under their direction or dictation. In the first case, the more hands the lighter the work; and in the second, the more applicants for a job the smaller the wages they would be willing to accept for their work. And so, the real reason why this class of objectors did as they did, was virtually the same as that of their two predecessors. They all wanted a multitude of men and women to serve their own particular needs, and to keep the stream of such always bank-full they all opposed any limitation to the springs from which a bounteous supply of the material they wanted flowed.

The means which this third class has always used for securing its ends has always been largely of the legislative sort. They have made laws which tended to stimulate reproduction or to prevent anything like the exercise of the will on the part of the parents in the matter of bringing children into the world. That is, they have tried to keep the breeding of human beings as near the line of mere animality as possible. They have endeavored to have men and women produce progeny on a par with the rest of animal life. They have held that the sole purpose of sex in human beings was for reproductive purposes, and they have always strongly inveighed against any "meddling with Nature's ways." They have held that "instinct" was a safe and sane guide in all these affairs, and they have always said: "Let them alone. They will find the way!"

As a matter of fact, what this class of objectors has done in this field of human affairs, far surpasses in wrongness and evil results the things that the two other factors I have mentioned have been responsible for. I need not go into details, but the breeders of slaves for commercial purposes, and the exploiters of the poverty-stricken for the sake of gain, have always been of this class. The horrors which both of these have enacted are too awful to tell. And all the evil they have done has been by way of keeping children from being born by *choice*, and to perpetuate *chance* as a factor in reproduction, ever and always.

And there is one item in which all three of these objectors and opposers of birth control have always been a unit, namely, they have never had any idea of The Plus of Humanity, especially as this prime factor in the make-up of mankind should be taken into account in the matter of human sex-functioning. They have all reckoned it as a quality which was chiefly, if not wholly animal, and have always treated it as such.

And, indeed, there are those who have claimed to come up into a higher realm in the study and exploitation of this part of human life, namely, certain theorists regarding eugenics, who have really done not much better in their philosophies than have these three classes of objectors I have just pointed out. For they have based nearly all of their theories upon results that have been obtained exclusively from the breeding of mere animals. Some of these have ranked high in scientific esteem, and they have been widely quoted with approval by leaders in whom the rank and file have had the greatest confidence. And yet, I do not know of even one of these who has taken the Plus of Humanity into account in his reckoning! They breed rabbits and Guinea pigs and pigeons, and from the results thus obtained, they deduce laws which they claim should obtain in the perpetuation of the human species. But never a word have they set down regarding the affectional expression of the sex-impulse in mankind, nor have they suggested any method of procedure on the part of husbands and wives, so far as reproduction is concerned, which was above that of the brutes upon which they experimented. For this cause, little real knowledge has so far been gained from scientific circles regarding this subject which is of such vital importance in the upbuilding and progress of the human race, in its highest and best estate. And so, as a matter of fact, even these advocates of what they claim would be a better order of things, for the human race, really treat the whole subject on so low and material a plane that little if any good has, or can, result from what they have done or what they propose. What is needed in this whole affair is to give it a mental and spiritual standing in which the principle of the Plus of Humanity shall be recognized as the chief element to be considered in securing results that shall be really worth while.

And the reason for this is, as all know who have studied this subject by taking all the factors into account, that the breeding of mere animals is one thing, and the bringing of human beings into this world is quite another thing! The Patriarch Jacob may have secured the finest of Laban's herds for himself by having the strongest cattle copulate with the bright rods before their eyes at the moment of conception, with the result that the calves born from such unions were ring-streaked and striped; but no such definite results have ever followed from any conceptional environment in the case of human beings. Mere animals have no "Plus" in their make-up; and the fact is that the "Plus" which humanity possesses in its own right, and as its distinctive quality among all life-forms—that it is this which has more to do with reproductive results in the human species than have all the material elements in the problem combined. And that is something to think about, and what I am trying to bring to the fore in what I am writing. It is also the reason why the objectors to birth control, and the advocates of eugenics who treat the subject on a mere material plane, both need to mend their ways by taking into their reckoning this greatest of all items in the matter of righteous sex-functioning of human beings.

So much regarding the objectors and the objections to the proposition to make the bringing of children into this world a matter of choice rather than of chance. It remains to make answer to these, which let us here undertake to do as follows:

The common element in all opponents to the proposition is, that such order of things undoubtedly would reduce the number of children born, and that this would be a calamity to the world, especially to their part in it. The military leaders claim that their need of soldiers would be impossible of supply; the church leaders declare that their source of support would be greatly lessened, and the employers of labor insist that if the number of their possible employees be reduced wages will rise, and this they look upon as a condition to be avoided if possible. Let us look at these claims, one by one, and see how well founded they are, when all the facts are taken into account.

In the first place, it is by no means certain, as I have already suggested, that the total population of any particular country or countries, or of the world as a whole, would necessarily be greatly lowered under the method of sex-living proposed. It might be, or it might not be; and to have a *choice* between these two conditions would be an attainment in human social affairs of no small moment! The item in the count which would make any great decrease in the total of population possibly improbable is the fact that, with the birth rate lowered, the death rate of such children as were born would be greatly lessened, so that the total survivors left to grow to maturity might thus *possibly* be as great as under present conditions, where millions of chance-born children now die annually, both because they are so numerous that they cannot receive from their over-productive mothers the prenatal vitality which they needed to enable them to reach adult life, or because they were so poorly nourished in their childhood, because of the poverty of their parents that they perished from lack of such nutrition as their maintenance in life demanded they should have at this period of their existence. In other words, it is but good common sense to believe that, with fewer children born, the probabilities of survival for those who were born would be greatly increased, and so the total reaching maturity might not be lessened in the long run. Or to say it still another way, an improvement in the quality of the children that were born by *choice,* would make up for the lessening of the quantity born by *chance.* This also would seem to be good common sense.

But, granting for the sake of the argument that there would be a falling off of adult population as compared with the past and present ratio of increase, if the birth rate were lowered by having children born by *choice* rather than by *chance,* this can be truthfully said of such a condition, namely, that, *for all of these objectors, there is no longer the need that there once was that they be as bountifully supplied with human beings with which to advance or protect their interests as there once was, indeed, as there has always been up to the present time!* Let us see how this is.

Take the military situation first. At first thought it would seem that the change that has so recently come to the whole world in this regard was unique to a degree that could not be equaled. Yet, such is not the case, as we shall soon see. But consider the military status of the nations of the earth, as it exists today, and as it was before the great world war which has just closed. Only a few short years ago, practically all these nations stood hostilely armed against each other. Virtually there was a chip on the shoulder of every one of them. Some of the chips were larger than others, but in all cases, a chip of some size was there. Under these conditions, in every case, that chip had to be looked after, and it could be looked after in only one way, and that was at the point of a bayonet or the mouth of a cannon. And it takes soldiers to wield bayonets and to fire cannon. And so all the nations in all the earth were compelled to maintain an army at least of such size as they deemed was necessary to protect their own particular chip. And there you are. The result of this was that the whole world was practically an armed camp, equipped or ready to be equipped, fighting or easily made ready to fight. And all the world knows the rest of the story.

Under these universal conditions there was only one way to maintain the interests of any nation, and that was by having a large number of soldiers, real or prospective, ready to do battle as needs required. And to have such supply of soldiers meant a constant and ample supply of boy babies born in every nation on earth. These facts are so trite that there is scarce need of recounting them. We all know how these things were.

But now! Why, now, the probabilities are many to one that all these things will be different, henceforth, and forever! As I write, the details for a world peace have not been fully formulated, but that some arrangements will be made which will result in such a condition—of this there can be small doubt in the eternal order of things. I know there are still some doubting souls who cannot believe that this assumption is warranted, but the like has always been whenever progress in any line of life has been made in this old world of ours. There were those who would not believe that the earth was round though the fact was proven beyond peradventure. And even I can remember when it was publicly denied that it was possible for a man to sit in a chair in New York and talk to a man equally at ease in San Francisco. And, of course, no one could ever fly! And to stand on the ground and communicate with a man who was miles high in the air, surely that could never be done! But it has been done, and it will be done, long years after these doubters have gone to their reward! These things are not only here, but they are here to stay, and to grow to more and more, by way of perfection, as time goes on.

And, by the same token, not only has the possibility of an amicable adjustment of national and international affairs of the world without war, come to mankind, but once inaugurated it will *come to stay!*

Need I argue this point further? Surely not here. Only let me add that with ten millions of the finest young men in all the world dead, and with many times that number made cripples for life, to say nothing of untold billions of money worse than wasted which numberless generations must be taxed to pay—take all these things together, the whole world has learned the lesson that war is a horror unbearable and the people of the world have made up their minds that they will have no more of it. And these facts, which are patent to all open-minded people, will insure the stability of some sort of mutual relationship between all the nations of the earth, a condition which will, in time, bring about the abolition of militarism as the chief factor in national life.

And, with the passing of militarism as a supreme factor in national life, there will go the further necessity of the maintenance of the armies and navies of the world; and that means that the fathers and mothers of the world will not longer feel compelled to beget and rear as many boys to be used as food for cannon as they used to be required to produce and care for. And that is at least a partial answer to the military objectors to having children born by *choice* rather than by *chance.*

Next, take the church contingent, and see what the situation is there as regards this issue. And here much the same conditions obtain as are found in the military part of the social life of mankind. Only there is this difference, namely, that, whereas, multitudes of soldiers are no longer needed to fight the battles of the world, on the part of the church, such multitudes of contributors as were once needed to further its objects of exploitation are no longer required to carry on the work which now falls to its lot to perform. A moment's reflection will show how this is.

Up to very modern times, the church, in its various forms and denominations, not only looked after the salvation of the souls of its membership, but it provided for the education of the children of its people, and looked after the physical recuperation of the sick and afflicted among all its parishioners. That is, the various church organizations, all over the world, not only built temples of great magnificence where their followers might worship, but they also established schools and universities, many of them of the highest rank and efficiency, wherever they held sway, and they maintained hospitals where thousands of their afflicted communicants might be cared for with the utmost that skill and devotion could command. All these items stand to the credit of the churches which have promulgated and supported them through all the years, and none too high praise can be given all of them for their good works on all these lines.

And it has taken the most generous supply and expenditure of money to carry on all these helps for humanity. And to furnish this money, a great following of people has been an absolute necessity. As before noted, this is one great reason why the church leaders have always been so anxious to have as large a constituency as possible to fall back upon, and upon whom they might limitlessly call for the means with which to carry on their most laudable institutions and undertakings. These are all well-known and gladly acknowledged facts by all well-posted people.

But—and here again appear the changed conditions which have come in modern times, and which practically appear today in most, if not all the countries in the world where churches are in evidence as factors in the social life of the communities in which they exist. This changed condition is as follows, namely, that whereas, under the former order, these religious organizations looked after the education of the children of their people and cared for their sick and afflicted, now, and in recent years, the civil institutions which collective mankind have set up and which they maintain along all these lines, do all this work which churches once did, and so have relieved these organizations from the immense financial burdens which they once were obliged to carry.

That is, the church leaders no longer need the immense sums of money which they were once required to have, because others are doing, and doing well, the work they were once required to perform. And with the passing of this obligation on their part, there passes the necessity for the immense following which they were once obliged to have.

Perhaps it should be said that many of these religious organizations, out of sheer inertia, still maintain their schools and hospitals, but the need of their continuing to do so is lessening every day; and the time is not far distant when the civil institutions of the world will take care, and good care, of all these needs of their citizens. The public schools, colleges and universities will educate all the children of all the people, and public hospitals and helpful institutions of various kinds, will take care of all the sick and afflicted who may need their generous and kindly assistance.

Let nothing that has been said regarding the work of religious organizations in the world be interpreted as even suggesting that their work is done, or that they are no longer needed as efficient factors for furthering the well-being of mankind. On the contrary, their mission in the economy of social life is, in some respects, greater than ever. But, as in so many other cases which have come in the reorganization of gregarious life, their part in the programme has been intensified rather than enlarged, and it is now their lot to minister to the spiritual, rather than to the material needs of their followers. And all the signs of the times indicate that they will do this better than ever before. The point in what I have to say is, as I have already suggested, that, to meet such spiritual needs, they will not require the vast sums of money they have heretofore been obliged to have, and so will not suffer even if the number of their constituents is comparatively lessened.

And so it will fall out in due time that the church leaders also can cease their opposition to having children born by *choice* and consent to their coming into being only by *choice*, as their parents want them, and are able to provide for them as children ought to be provided for.

And as for the employers of labor, their case is more easily righteously disposed of than that of either the military or the church leaders. This, because of the fact that machinery now does the great bulk of the work of the world which was once done by hand, and hence there is no longer need that there be so many hands as once were required to do the work that must be done. As I shall have to consider this factor of social life at greater length in a following chapter, I leave it here with this partial statement of the main facts in the situation, as they pertain to this part of the subject.

And so it turns out that, even if the bringing of children into this world by *choice* rather than by *chance* should lower the rate of increase of adult population in the world, such a result would not be detrimental to the race as a whole, things being as they are. But more of this further on in my argument.

CHAPTER XIV

WHEN SHALL THESE THINGS BE?

It is a number of years since I first entertained the idea of *choice* rather than *chance* becoming a recognized principle in the reproduction of the human race, and began to plan the writing of such a book as I am now writing; but it was not till a few months ago that I felt warranted in really undertaking the task which I am now working out. The reason of this will occur to the reader on a moment's reflection, as follows:

So long as militarism was and continued to be the chief factor in the policies and practices of all the nations of the earth, it would be impossible for such a plan as I have proposed to be carried out, even to a limited degree. Because, under these conditions, as I have already shown, necessity required that every nation should have at its call and command as large a number of soldiers as possible, and if any nation, or nations, failed to maintain such military resources, while other nations continued to produce the same, it would be but a matter of time until those which had the most numerous armies could, and would, conquer and subjugate those which were not their numerical equals.

As a matter of fact, France stood as an ever present example of a nation open to such danger, and it is a matter of history that she came very near suffering overwhelming defeat for this cause. As a nation, the French people have perhaps come nearer practicing birth control, that is, having children by *choice* rather than by *chance*, than any other people in all the world. Under these conditions, at one time the birth rate in that country fell so low that it became a cause of genuine alarm to those who had the welfare of the nation at heart; nor was such fear by any means unwarranted. With all the other nations about her breeding children by *chance*, and so in limitless supply, while she produced children in only limited numbers, as her fathers and mothers *chose* to do under such circumstances, it was mathematically certain what the outcome of such order of things would ultimately be. It was in view of this situation that the ruling powers in France appealed to their constituents, in many ways, and stimulated parents to be as prolific as possible, and so help avert the possible calamity of national destruction. And it is a note-worthy fact that such appeal brought results! Note that fact for further reference.

And so it was that I saw in the case of France an example which demonstrated the impossibility of any one nation, or of a few nations, espousing and acting upon the principle of birth by *choice,* while all the rest of the nations kept on breeding by *chance.* And so long as this condition of affairs lasted, I realized the futility of even suggesting what I have advocated in this book.

But now, all this is bound to be different! The world-war has brought a change in human affairs which will not only make it possible to propose birth control as an efficient factor in social life, but it has really precipitated a condition in national existence in which the adoption and practice of such method of populating the earth in the coming years will be not only a workable proposition, but an absolute necessity, as I shall soon show!

As to the first point, the situation of all the different peoples of the earth is now such as to make the practice of birth control possible, provided the means for so doing are definitely found out and then made available for all the fathers and mothers of the world! For now, since the military factor of social life is no longer to be in evidence as the chief element of national existence, it follows that any and all nations are at liberty to abandon the chief source of supply upon which militarism has always relied to give it prestige.

Of course, such change will not come all at once, or suddenly, to any nation, much less to all nations; but, the science of human reproduction, on a basis of *choice* rather than *chance* once discovered, and its practice actually inaugurated, its spread will be assured in due time, all over the whole earth. This cannot be otherwise, for the advantages to be thus obtained, to all parties concerned, are so many and so great that, once realized, they will be universally adopted, as fast as they can become known.

Never before in the history of the world has such an attainment as this been possible; but it is possible now, and because it is possible, and because the results it would bring about are so desirable, and in time will become so necessary, the establishment of such order of living for the whole human race is as sure to be realized as is any other good thing which has come about in the line of the progress of mankind. For such is the natural and eternal order of things.

All of which means that, the establishment of these conditions will sometime become, not only a national, but an international affair. And, more than this, it will apply alike to all classes of people, rich and poor, high and low, or what you will. In this respect it will be like the dissemination of learning which is now becoming so wide-spread, and which will sometime be universal. Time was when the acquirement of an education was confined to a select few; and there have been many nations where even to teach a child to read, outside certain select circles, would subject the teacher to punishment, sometimes of the severest sort. But such conditions have passed, never to return, so far as education is concerned. Even so, up to date, the meager knowledge of birth control which the wisest have so far discovered has been confined to a certain few who have had the money to clandestinely obtain such knowledge as has been found out, or the power to defy the laws which have prevented a dissemination of what is known in these regards.

(It is on such facts, namely, what the few who had knowledge have done, that the principle has been announced that the higher the type of human beings, the less these would reproduce. And from such alleged logical position it has been reasoned that there would never be any danger of over-populating the world, etc. The fallacy of this argument lies in the false basis upon which it rests. It is not so much the inability to bear children upon the part of those who are so nearly childless, as it is their being able to avail themselves of such knowledge and practices as result in limiting the number of their progeny. But more of this later.)

But, under an order of things in which positive scientific knowledge regarding birth control is an actual human possession, and, as such, can be universally disseminated, the item of bringing children into this world will then be a matter of *choice* and not of *chance* for all husbands and wives everywhere. That is, with the passing of militarism, the possibility of the exercise of the will as a factor in the reproduction of the human species will become realizable.

Again, for the first time in the history of the world, science has now reached such a degree of attainment that it is possible for it to solve the intricate problem of conception as it occurs in the human species. And that is another fact which can be set down as making the present the acceptable time for undertaking the establishment of *choice* rather than *chance* as the chief factor in bringing children into this world.

Up to date, the whole matter of the actual condition under which a woman may conceive is practically an unknown quantity. As noted in a previous chapter, it is known that such a result comes from the union of the male and female germ-cells; but what the conditions are, or must be, under which such cells will, or will not unite—all this is, for the most part, still a matter of mystery. And it is to the clearing up of this mystery that the science of the future must devote itself. And it will do this just as soon as it is safe for it to bend its energies in that direction, not before. That is, it will do this when the laws which now practically brand as a crime even a search for such knowledge are removed from the statute books of the states and the nations of the world. Then, but not before.

But, with these barriers to human progress removed, that scientific men and women will devote themselves to the solution of this most important of all human problems—of this there is not a doubt. And it is equally certain that, having once undertaken this task, they will never cease laboring upon it till they have found what they were looking for. And they will do this sometime. And now is the accepted time for them to be set to this work.

In which connection it may be remarked that Germany, with her characteristic definite methods for arriving at conclusions and results, took advantage of certain opportunities which the war offered by making some interesting studies and experiments along the lines of birth control, in a way, as follows: By deliberately arranging the meeting-time of furloughed soldiers and their wives, and by noting the sex of the children born from such meetings, they deduced certain laws regarding the determination of the sex of a child at the time of its conception, which promised to be of great value to the future of the nation in its aim to be the greatest military power in the world. Of course, what Germany was anxious to find out was, how to breed boys, who would in time make soldiers; and many of the results they obtained go to show that it is quite possible to realize the results they aimed to secure.

It goes without saying that the gaining of this particular item of knowledge has no definite relation to the matter of determining, by *choice,* the number of children that any husband and wife may have, but it does establish the possibility of at least some positive knowledge being obtained in this most complicated of all human problems, when the same is sought after and pursued under scientific control and by methods that will yield determinable results. It is such scientific research, properly and righteously applied in times of peace that will yield the knowledge that will be required to make positive birth control in all its phases, an actuality. And now is the accepted time for undertaking such work, which, up to the present, has never been possible of even trying for.

One more reason why now is the accepted time for undertaking this task, is the fact that the recent world-war has swept away mountains of prudery and prejudice regarding sex life and sex living which have heretofore barred all attempts at progress towards bettering the status of mankind in these most essential matters of human life. Books are now written and read in which the item of sex in the human race is treated in a manner that would not have been tolerated but a few years ago. More than this, newspapers and magazines print columns, and even pages, upon this subject, and all these are read by millions of persons who, but a short time ago, would have turned pale, or red, at the very thought of reading what they now read without a tremor of any sort, and "without shame, or the thought of shame." All of which is as it should be.

Added to all this, the Government of the United States has recently begun the publication and distribution of sex literature, on a very extended scale, much of which would not have been permitted to go through the mails only a few years ago. Some of these documents are of a very pronounced sort, and deal with the subject in no uncertain way. They "call a spade a spade" and discuss sex matters in terms that he who runs may read and understand. And the government officials are broad-casting this literature through the mails to the extent of millions of copies annually.

Besides these new departures on the part of the press and the government, such staid and heretofore almost if not quite "purist" institutions as the Y. M. C. A. and the Y. W. C. A. have left their old negative hush and don't moorings, and are now sailing out into a more open sea of light and air in the item of sex-knowledge. Both these institutions are doing much towards the dissemination of information regarding sex, as a factor in human life. They have lectures given upon these subjects, and they distribute much literature which has sex for its theme. They have special counselors and advisors upon sex matters, who can be consulted by their members, and in many ways they are carrying on propaganda along these lines which is far in advance of anything that has ever before existed. And all of this makes for the possibility of the rightful consideration of the subject of birth control and its related issues.

And, beyond all this, many of the public schools of the United States now include the study of sex hygiene in their courses of study; and in nearly all the higher institutions of learning of the country, the colleges and universities, education in matters pertaining to sex is a part of the regular curriculum. It is true that none of these means for the dissemination of long and much needed sex-knowledge have as yet gone very deeply into the subject, and that there is much left for them to do before they reach an efficiency which is so greatly to be desired. But that they have made the beginning which they have is in itself most significant, and that they will continue in the good way they have started to travel is certain. Gradually they will abandon the prudishness and false-modesty which now appear in much of their teaching, and with the passing of these will go many errors in their instruction regarding righteous sex-functioning and its rightful place in the economy of normal human life.

Many of these new and favorable conditions regarding sex-knowledge are the results of the recent war, which has done much toward opening the eyes of mankind in many directions where heretofore they saw nothing. Such results were not planned for nor provided for, but they have arrived in spite of all opposition, and they are here to stay. They have also opened the minds of the multitudes so that they are now prepared to study and consider a subject which has, heretofore, always been taboo, in a way which is decent and wholesome—in a way never, till just now, possible.

And so, these things which I have outlined and plead for in what I have so far written, will gradually become realities as new social conditions are introduced and established in the civic, industrial and religious forms of community life; and the signs of the times indicate that the beginning, at least, of such new order of things, in all these items, are not only at hand, but an entire change, from what has been to what may be, has already made marked and substantial progress towards positive fulfillment.

These are some of the reasons why it would seem that "now is the accepted time" to take up and master the matter of having children born by *choice* rather than by *chance*, and of bringing the whole item of sex-expression in the human species up out of the realm of mere animality, and of establishing it upon the higher and holier plane of the Plus of Humanity, where it rightfully and righteously belongs. The world has waited long for the coming of such a time, but it has not waited in vain; for, even now, the day when these things shall be is dawning. Thanks be!

CHAPTER XV

SOME REASONS WHY WHAT SHOULD BE WILL BECOME WHAT MUST BE

So far in what I have written, I have spoken of the having of children by *choice* rather than by *chance* as something that *should* be. In this chapter, I shall show that this method of human reproduction not only *should* be, but that it *must* be; and that, for this cause, it some day *will* be. Some of my reasons for thinking this and for saying this are as follows:

In order to reach the conclusion I have just announced, it will be necessary to go a long way back into the history of the human race; indeed, to that far time when man, as man, began to be, and even farther than that, and to consider at least some of the ways and means that have been utilized to bring him to his present estate.

And the first item to note in such reconnoiter is the fact that PROGRESS *has always been a constant factor in the successions of life-expressions which have appeared in time and space.* In other words, the records of the workings of the Life-Force in this world as these appear, seriatim, establish the fact that it always has been, and still is, the purpose and design of the Power that underlies all things, and that is beneath and within all things, to continually make the good better and cause the better always to move toward the best. This is the basic and supreme law of all life, and toward its constant fulfillment all the processes of nature have moved, now move; and hence we believe will forever continue to move. That is, life is eternal progress. Either this is true, must be true, or else this old cosmos is but a jumble of chance products, a chaos of happenings, a lot of may-be-sos, a headless, formless and meaningless mass of nothings!

And the world cannot be that. Indeed, we know it is not that, by the records of life-advancements which written and pre-historic history furnish for man to read. These all show that there are now higher life-forms than there were aeons ago, and that man himself, as one of these life-forms, has advanced, in many ways, from his primitive conditions to his present attainments.

And this means that the world is now really better than it has been. No sane and thoughtful human being can deny that fact.

And if this is so, by the same token it is not straining a point to conclude that what has been will be; and that means that PROGRESS *can always be counted on as a constant factor in the successions of life-expressions which are* YET TO APPEAR *in time and space.*

If this is not so, life is not worth living—any form of it! But it is so, and so life is worth living—all forms of it!

True, this progress has not always been of equal speed in its outworkings and varied manifestations, nor has it been without what seemed, for the time being, positive breaks in its forward march. There have been occasions when the wheels of advancement, in all forms of life-expression, seemed to roll backward, rather than forward, even to the extent that, now and then, it might truthfully be written of almost any life-form "the last estate is worse than the first." But from all such retrogressions Life has rallied, and in the next forward movement it has surpassed all its former high-marks of achievement; and so, through the years, the total acquirements of the varied expressions of the Life-Force, as a whole, have been from more to more, from the good to the better, and from the better ever towards the best.

Such is the fundamental principle that *all* of Nature's processes are based upon, and upon which they all work. The particular one of these workings-out that we have to deal with in this book, is that which pertains to the human race; that is, the *progress of mankind,* from its simplest beginnings to its present estate, and from there on to its possible future attainments.

Not to dogmatize regarding the origin of the human species, as to how, when and where the race began, it can be safely asserted that from all the records of its upward journey that mankind has left in time and space, we are warranted in concluding that, so far as history can be made to testify, man began in a very low estate; and that, whether he emerged from some form of life below him or not, still, this is true, that all the records show that the early types of the race were of a very brutal nature, and in many ways but little above the other forms of animal life with which they were surrounded. That is, in his primitive condition, the great majority of characteristics which man possessed were animal rather than mental or spiritual; and the mission of the Life-Force, working in this being, has always been for the purpose of developing in him a preponderance of these higher qualities, over and above those of the grosser elements with which he was primarily endowed; that is, to add to his lower nature a PLUS, which should be the chief characteristic of his humanity.

This is a somewhat general statement of the gradual trend and progress of the human race from its lowest to its highest estates.

And in all of man's *earlier* advancements, and to a greater or less degree in all his forward movements thus far, the impelling force that has moved him on and up has been a *compulsion* rather than an *attraction!* He has advanced because he *had to* rather than because he *desired to.* The great bulk of all that primitive man did was the result of *instinct* rather than of any other incitement to action; and, as I have already shown, instinct's only method of working is that of compulsion, without initiative, thought, or impulse on the part of the actor. All life-forms below man are guided and controlled by instinct only, and instinct never causes any progress whatever on the part of the being through which it alone acts.

But it was ordained that *human beings* should *progress* into a new and a higher order of life-expression, and so it became the business of the Life-Force to move man up out of the *instinctive* realm in which he, for the most part, primitively functioned, into a higher condition in which *personal initiative* should be the impelling cause for his acts, and *his own will* should be the constant main-spring of his endeavors and accomplishments.

And as man has advanced in his upward path, there has been a constant diminution of instinct as the impelling force for his activities, and a corresponding and continual increase in initiative ability on his own part, the central core of which has been his own independent will, manifesting itself in the forms of *impulse* and *intuition*, of *desire*, *imagination* and *ingenuity*, in a word, in The Plus of Humanity!

Such are the fundamental principles which have obtained in the human uplift, from the first even until now.

Now it is a common characteristic of all life-forms that the lower they are in the scale of existence the more insensate they are, and the harder it is to stimulate them so as to arouse a response on their part. From this it follows that the cruder the life-form the more intense must be the stimulus to arouse it to action. These are simple and well-known facts, but they need to be stated just here to introduce the argument we are now entering upon.

And to make this situation perhaps still clearer than ever, as it applies to human beings, let us repeat in another form, before we go on, that the problem that the Life-Force had on hand, so far as man was concerned, was to take a being which was primarily moved to action almost entirely by *instinct* alone, and to build onto, or into the same, such faculties and requirements as would make of him a self-conscious, self-inspiring, self-directing, self-directed and self-acting individuality! I take it that this is exactly what is meant by the words: "And God said: Let us make man *in our own image!*" Because, self-consciousness, self-inspiration, self-direction, self-action—all these are, must be, qualities of the Infinite Source of All Things!

And so, since man, as really man, began as, for the most part, chiefly an instinctive being, (Of course, since he was now at least *some* human instead of *all mere brute*,—for it was this added something which began to distinguish him from the forms of life below him—he had in his make-up, even then, at least the rudiments of the higher faculties with which he was in time to be more fully endowed) it was by acting on these minor elements of his nature that his progress was to be secured. And since these rudiments of a higher form of life were but crude and undeveloped beginnings, they could only be appealed to by crude stimuli as a means of awakening a response on the part of their possessor.

And so it was that the Life-Force brought to bear upon primitive man such crude means of arousing his attention and securing his initiative activities as war, famine, poverty, pestilence, disease and vice in various forms. All these were to act, and did act, as stimuli to the dormant or slightly developed faculties which existed in the earlier forms of human life. And the resistance to all these was grounded in human selfishness! It was from such gross beginning as unmixed self-benefiting that the highest of human altruisms has come! Truly, the old hymn was right, which said:

"God moves in a mysterious way,
His wonders to perform."

I need not go into extended details as to just what each or all of these crude stimuli have done, and, in some measure, are still doing for mankind. If you will stop to think it out, you can discover for yourself what these are, at least for the most part. And as you proceed with such thinking, you will see that all these appeals to dense humanity came to him in the following order, namely, *desire, imagination* and *ingenuity.* I suppose that behind these lay *impulse* and *intuition,* which are the primary human qualities which were the basic cause of strictly human activities, as distinguished from *instinctive* activities. But, with the implanting in a life-form of *impulse* and *intuition* there followed, in natural sequence, human activities which were initiated and carried forward at the behest of *desire, imagination* and *ingenuity.* This is the common history of all human achievements, of all human progress. And, be it remembered that mere animals have none of these qualities, as such!

And so it is that *war,* which is the crudest and grossest of all these forces which have incited mankind to actions which resulted in progress, stimulated man to enlarge the sphere of his influence and power and to gain a wider sway for the exploitation of himself and his belongings. To be sure, animals had always fought, but animal fighting is one thing and war, as carried on by human beings, is quite another thing! All animal fighting was of a strictly individual sort. One animal fought another animal for any one of many reasons. More than this, such methods of fighting as they used were purely instinctive. No training was needed for their acquirement, and no practice improved their method of attack or defense. In all their conflicts, *imagination* had no part, nor did *ingenuity* in any way add to their prestige.

But when man began to give expression to the warlike part of his nature, *desire* forwarded what *impulse* had started within him, *imagination* took up the possibilities involved, and *ingenuity* set itself to the task of successfully working out what its predecessors had brought to it for accomplishment. And so concerted actions were devised, a manual of arms was thought out and formulated, drill was inaugurated, discipline was maintained, and so the *Art of war* was developed. Animals have no art of war! It was a crude form of the plus of humanity, resulting from the response of mankind to the stimulus of war, that produced both the science and the art of war, which, low down as they are in the scale of human activities, have, taken as a whole, tended to lift man from the sphere of instinct into the realm of a higher order of action based upon his own will and initiative! Grant that the method was gross and harsh and cruel, still, it accomplished what it was set to do, and who shall say that such outcome could have been realized in any other way?

Suppose you try to think of some other way in which it might have been realized—of some other way of raising a nearly mindless and almost wholly instinctive being into a condition in which he would be a rational personality, acting on his own initiative, and producing results which were solely the product of his own activities. Do not devise miracles for bringing such a change about, for such have no place in Nature's economies; but see if you can think of any other way than the one the Life-Force has used at the hands of war, for producing the results in humanity which war has brought about!

Now, this is not deifying war, nor claiming that, since it has done so much for the human race, it should always remain as a factor for the advancement of mankind. It is only saying that, when man was in his primitive and low estate, this crude means for raising him to a higher life-level, did work the transformation! That's all! It was an instrument in the order of man's evolution for increasing in him the Plus of Humanity which was destined to become the chief characteristic of his human nature. So much for war as a stimulant to progress on the part of primitive man.

In the same general line of crude and gross stimuli which were used to arouse primitive man from his insensate condition of almost entire animality, and to set his feet on the upward path of human progress, mental and spiritual, which developed the Plus of Humanity in him, come famine, poverty, pestilence, disease, vice, and other life-opposing forces whose overcoming tended to develop in the overcomers higher and more worthy life-attainments. I need not trace, in detail, just what each of these stimulants to mankind did for human advancement. Enough for the argument that they all were utilized as means for pushing, or forcing, if you will, individuals and the race as a whole, from a lower to a higher condition of life. That much is certain, and that much is sufficient for the present presentment. That is, it took "hard knocks" to arouse the primitive man from his early conditions, and to develop in him a plus of humanity. Let that part of the argument rest just here for the moment.

The next item to notice in what we are now trying to get at is the fact that it is a great and fundamental law of nature that *any and every species of life-forms will multiply beyond the limits of its possible food supply unless its surplus is in some way checked!*

Now, there is no exception to this law! It applies to all life-forms which have ever appeared in time and space, and it is Nature's way of doing things, from which there is no appeal or escape. Drive another peg there, and drive it so deep that it will never pull up!

The Scientists' way of accounting for this state of things is, that Nature, in order to make sure of the persistence of each and every species, always produces a *surplus* of the individuals composing that form of life, and then, not to permit that surplus to go to such extreme that it will result in defeating its own object, by becoming so numerous that it will entirely exhaust the food supply of the entire species, it provides "checks" for this over-supply, which destroy enough of the individuals to keep the total of the species within the limits of its means of subsistence. This is another illustration of the "prodigality of Nature" which we saw manifest in our study of the germ-cells which appear in such unlimited supply in the reproduction of life-forms of all sorts. This surplus of cells we noted were destroyed in many ways, and so were rendered useless before they could be utilized; and we also saw that if they were all utilized, the world itself could not contain the amount of what they would produce. If every apple blossom developed into a full-grown apple, every apple-tree of any considerable size would produce a car-load of apples! If all the eggs which all the fishes lay were hatched, and if all that were hatched grew to maturity, the ocean itself would be stiff with fish in a single year, and there would be no water to sail on or in! And what is true in these cases is correspondingly true in all cases of the reproduction of life-forms, in any and all species.

And so it is that Nature provides "checks" which dispose of all "surpluses" and so keep the prodigality of Nature from defeating its own ends. These are all well-known facts; but they have to be built into our argument to make it invincible, in and of itself.

Now, the human species is no exception to this universal law! We have seen what a surplus of human germ-cells are produced, as compared with the number which are really utilized. And it is surely a self-evident fact that, if every one of these human germ-cells developed into a full-grown man or woman, the world itself could not contain the product of even a single generation! And so the surplus of human germ-cells is "checked," that is, they are not permitted to mature to the full extent of their primal and inherent possibilities!

And, by the same token, if all the children who are born into this world grew to maturity, the world would very soon be vastly over-populated.

All we have to do to verify the truth of these statements is to use a little mathematics on the proposition, and the whole thing will be clearly demonstrated, beyond all controversy. For instance, count that the population of any country, or of the world, if left unchecked, will double itself every fifty years, and then realize the certainty that it is many thousands of years since man first appeared in the world, and see what soon comes from such figuring! I'll not take the time to work this problem out for you, for you can do it as well as I can. Besides, if you will work it out for yourself you will have a far better realizing sense of the actual force of the figures than you would have if I should do the work for you.

But I need not argue this point further, just here. Its truth is so easily verified that it is almost self-evident. And the truth is that, were it not for "checks," of some sort, the human species would long since have become so numerous that the world itself could not contain it. And so it turns out that there must have been "checks" upon the surplus of the human species in the past, or the world of today would not be a possibility, so far as its present population is concerned. This is an undeniable fact. Count it as such, and see what follows—*must follow!*

Now, when we come to look for the "checks" which have removed the surplus of the human species, we find the chief of these to have been war, famine, poverty, pestilence, disease and vice. There have been some other "checks," it is true, but they are really of minor importance when compared with these six great deterrents for the increase of the human species. It is these six which have been in evidence as the wholesale reducers of the human surplus, ever since the race began! This is another almost self-evident proposition.

And now here is a most remarkable fact, namely, that these six great checks upon the human surplus are the very same means which were used by the Life-Force to stimulate man in his primal insensate condition, and to force him up and into a higher state of being and existence. And this might well be noted as an instance of the Economy of Nature, which thus uses one and the same means for the accomplishment of double and different results! A wonderful thing is Nature, or the Life-Force!

With these points established, here is one more to consider as immediately related to them, as follows: As already suggested, it is a principle in the working of the Life-Force that the grosser the material in which it works, the harsher the measures it must use to produce desired results. And, per contra, the finer and more subtle the medium it has to manipulate, the more delicate the means it utilizes to obtain its objects. In other words, *compulsion* is the basis of progress for all crude forms of life; *invitation* is the power that lures men on when they have become sensitive enough to be subject to its gracious influences. The force that is behind the material world and which makes it move on is the "big stick!" In the higher realms of life, "the spirit beckons!" The law of the animal man is "go!" The principle that animates all the Plus in humanity is "come!" And there is all the difference between heaven and hell in those two words, if an attempt is made to use them in other realms than those in which they rightly belong. If you say "come," and only that, to the animal man, you "cast pearls before swine, and they will trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you!" (What wonderfully true sayings there are in the Old Book!) If you say "go," and only that, to all that is plus in humanity, you act the part of "a bull in a china shop," and nothing but the most lamentable ruin can result from your so doing!

And so it is that, as man has risen in the scale of being, has come up out of the realm of brutality and entered into the sphere of mentality and spirituality, that is, into the plus of humanity, there has been less and less need of using the "big stick" to insure his progress, and more and more opportunity for love to lure him on! This is another fundamental law of Nature—of the Life-Force!

All of which, of course, means that, as man has advanced in the scale of being, the less and less has been the need of the use of compulsion to secure his progress, and the more and more he has been able to move on and up of his own volition—impelled by his own power of *choice!*

And so it is an actual fact that the compelling forces which were brought to bear upon the primitive man to insure his progress are growing less and less needed to secure the results which they alone could produce under man's earliest conditions! These compelling forces, as we have already seen, were war, famine, poverty, pestilence, disease and vice. And just so soon as these have forced mankind up into a sphere of life where their influence is no longer needed, just so soon can they be eliminated, or excused from further service as factors in the progress of the human race!

This is the real reason why war is fast coming to an end in this world; why famine is now practically impossible in any part of the globe; why poverty is gradually, but certainly, disappearing (and bound to more and more disappear, as time goes on!); why pestilence is fast being swept out of existence; why disease is more and more yielding to control; and why vice is steadily being exterminated as a factor in the needs of mankind! (Now, don't insist that I prove, by statistics, that all these things are as I have just stated them. You know how they are as well as I do; and unless you are a determined and chronic pessimist you know that they are as I have said. And if you are just that, it is no use to try to prove to you what you would not accept, though one rose from the dead to clinch the demonstration! As Whitman says: "I am not saying these things for a dollar, nor to fill up time while I wait for a boat. It is you talking, just as much as myself. I act as the tongue of you. Tied in your mouth, in mine it begins to be loosened.")

But now, note this: Though man has undoubtedly moved on and up in the scale of being, and has, in large measure, entered into the realm of the Plus of Humanity; still, the physical possibilities for reproduction in the race remain as they were, and there is just as great a prodigality of Nature in these particulars now as there ever was! The men and women of today produce just as many human germ-cells as any men and women ever did; and unless there is *some* "*check*" put upon the efficiency of these, there is liable to be a greater surplus of human beings born under this new order of things than under the old régime! And this means that, if all the old "checks" are gone, some other which will do the work they did *must take their place,* or disastrous results are bound to follow!

For, be it always remembered, the law which always provides for a possible surplus in all species has never been repealed, and never will be repealed! And, since this is so, it creates a condition which must always be provided for, in one way or another. The old ways of so providing are past, or fast passing; and it inevitably follows that some other way must be established in its stead, or the new order will be worse than the old! I can find no way of escaping this conclusion! Can you?

Which things being so, what is clearer, what can be clearer, than that this new "check" upon the human surplus must be the human will—the deliberate power of choice on the part of the beings whose welfare and conditionings are now placed in their own hands, to be manipulated and directed as they desire, rather than as they are compelled to accept? In all other realms of life where primal conditions have been supplanted by more delicate means of producing desired results, it is the human will, acting through desire, imagination and ingenuity, which has been installed as the acting force in the premises. And if so there, why not here? I ask why?

If there is any other reasonable or rational answer to this question than the one I have proposed, I should be glad to be told what it is! Have you one in hand? I doubt it! And if you have not, what follows? Think this through!

Now I am well aware that much of what I have said so far in this chapter is not at all new. Others have said the same things, in various ways, for many years. And because they have done so, and there have been varied opinions about what they have said, I consider it worth while, and indeed practically necessary, that I review, somewhat briefly, what they have said, and the different things that have been said about these sayings and believings.

The chief of all these sayers was an English clergyman, Rev. T. R. Malthus, by name, who lived and wrote upon this subject something more than a hundred years ago. He was a thoughtful man, and a reasoner of rare ability, at least so far as cause and effect were concerned regarding what he wrote about. When it came to remedying affairs that needed betterment, it must be confessed he was not a great success. But one thing he surely did, and that was to call attention to the fact that nature always provides a surplus in every species of life, and that such surplus must be checked, in some way, or disastrous results are bound to follow.

The chief thing that Malthus did was to put the whole proposition he discussed into a very terse and telling mathematical formula, as follows: The natural increase in any species is according to the law of geometrical progression, while the possible increase in food supply can only be made according to the law of arithmetical progression. That is a fine scientific way of stating the situation; but, like all mathematical propositions, it needs demonstration; and the case it presents is so important as it stands related to what I am considering in this chapter, that I want to make it clear to every one of my readers. Besides this, experience has taught me that the great majority of people have forgotten most of the mathematics they ever knew; and so, if they are to get a full comprehension of the point I am now making, it would have to be only after looking the matter up, and that, *very* few of them would take the time and trouble to do. And so, if I am to get results (and I want to do just that) I shall be obliged to work out the demonstration, to a degree, at least, right here and now. Let us proceed to do this, as follows:

The law of *geometrical* progression requires a regular increase in a series of numbers by *multiplying* each number in the series, beginning with the first, by the same multiplier. That is, suppose we start with the number 2, and increase it according to the law of geometric progression by multiplying it, and the products which would result from such multiplication, in turn, by 2. If we do this, we shall have a series, as follows: 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64, 128, 256, and so on, as far as we care to carry the figures.

On the other hand, the law of *arithmetical* progression requires that a series of numbers be increased by the *addition* of the same number to each term in the series, beginning with the first. That is, if we start with the number 2, and use the number 2 as the constant number to be added to make a mathematically progressive series, we shall have, for such series, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, and so on, as far as we care to go. I think this will make it clear to you exactly what is meant by geometrical progression, and what by arithmetical progression. The first increases by *multiplying* by a constant number; the second by the *addition* of a constant number.

Now, if we understand this, let us see how it works out in the demonstration of the proposition laid down by Malthus. He says that the law of increase of population (for we need consider only the human species in his demonstration, though the principle applies to any and all species with equal force as well) is that of geometric progression, while that of food supply is in arithmetical progression. That is, if we start with 2 people, the law of their natural increase, from generation to generation, would produce results as follows, provided each generation doubled, as each came on, in turn: First generation 2; 2nd, 4; 3rd, 8; 4th, 16; 5th, 32; 6th, 64; 7th, 128; 8th, 256; and so on, as far as we care to go.

On the other hand, the food supply, on a given and constant area, would only increase for such population by *adding* the same amount of possible product by one generation to that produced by the generation following it, as follows: Food-supply for first generation 2. For 2nd, 4; 3rd, 6; 4th, 8; 5th, 10; 6th, 12; 7th, 14; 8th, 16, etc.

Putting these two computations together, it appears as clear as daylight that, beginning with 2 people, at the end of the 8th generation we should have a population of 256 from such origin; while, if all these people lived on the same area of land that their progenitors occupied, their food supply would be sufficient for but 16 of the 256! And that is something to think about! It is what Mr. Malthus asked folks to think about. Some have done so; others have not. But that all will have to think about it some time is as sure as sunrise. Some figures may be made to lie, but these are made to tell the truth! And they tell it, all right, whether man hear or whether they forhear!

This matter is so important to the items involved in the issues we are considering in this chapter, that I want to look at it from one more angle, which is a bit more concrete than the one just used, and so may prove more forcible to some of my readers:

Suppose that, at some given time, 100 people were living on a square mile of land, somewhere in the world, and that it was ordained that their descendants shall be confined to this area for six succeeding generations. (England had an average of over 600 people to each square mile of her area when the world-war broke out.) Suppose that this square mile was fertile enough to furnish an abundant supply of food for these 100 people, who would all together require about 40 tons of edibles each year to meet their needs. This would give each inhabitant about two-and-one-half pounds of food daily, which is a little more than the average daily ration for a soldier.

Suppose, next, that the average number of years for a generation of these people was thirty-three years, and that their increase, and their food-supply were according to the laws we have already noted. This would mean that, at the end of the first generation, there would be 200 people living on this square mile, which would then have to produce 80 tons of food to meet their needs. At the end of 100 years there would be 800 people on this square mile, which would then produce only 160 tons of food, instead of 320 tons which would be required to feed these folks as their great-grandfathers were fed. That is, these 800 people would be cut down to one-half the rations which their ancestors lived on. And under the action of these same laws, at the end of 200 years, there would be 3,200 people on this square mile, while the total product of this area could only produce enough to give each inhabitant 75 pounds of food a year, as against 800 pounds each, for the first generation! And it is easy to see that they would all starve to death, under such conditions!

To be sure, this is a supposed case, and the like of it has never practically existed. Still, it is but a truthful demonstration of a principle which is undeniably true, and which must and will eventually work out as here depicted, if left to act according to its own intrinsic qualities. As a quite definite proof of this, note the following:

Malthus lived just about 100 years ago. At the time he wrote, the British Islands had a population of about 11,000,000. He said that, while 33 years were counted as a generation, or the time in which any given population would double itself (as a matter of fact, in the early history of New England the population doubled in 18 years, from the excess of births over deaths; and there have been other colonies which have nearly equaled this ratio of increase in their beginning years), yet he would allow 50 years for the doubling of the population in these islands, or that they would double their number of inhabitants twice in the first 100 years after he wrote. This calculation would give these Islands a population of 44,000,000 at this time, according to his figures. The last census of the British Isles, taken shortly before the war, gave their total population at about 45,000,000, which shows that Malthus was not far wrong in his estimate.

But, to feed these people whose number is four times as great as it was a century ago, there was only two-and-one-half times as much food available, produced on its own territory, as there was one hundred years before. And this means much!

Meantime, be it remembered that, during all this century, *war* was still in evidence as a "check" upon the increase of population in these islands, and for much of the time it was grimly so! I need not enlarge on this fact. Its history is so recent that every school child knows it! The Irish *famine* is also included in this period; while the *poverty* that held sway during many of these years, in many parts of this domain, was of a most destructive nature. More than once, also, during this century, *pestilence* visited this locality, causing the deaths of many thousands of its inhabitants; *diseases*, many of them of a most malignant type, were widespread, during all this period, and *vice*, in its varied and virulent forms, took a tremendous toll of human lives as these hundred years went by. All these were "checks" upon the increase of the population of the British Isles during all this time, and yet, it was multiplied by *four* during this century. The item to consider is, what would the population of this area have been had these "checks" been much less than they were, or even if some of them had been entirely removed?

And yet, as these matters are today, all these "checks" are far less potent than they were a century ago, and they are all growing less and less destructive with every passing year! True, *war* is not, as yet, entirely gone, but the probabilities all are that it is far nearer the vanishing point than it has ever been in all the world's history, and the chances are many to one that it will never again rage as it has from the beginning until now. And with the present means of transportation, which are constantly growing more and more efficient, *famine* is now almost an impossibility even in any remote corner of the earth. Mr. Hoover has taught an unforgettable lesson in this regard. New social and industrial adjustments and regulations are making *poverty* less and less common than it formerly was. *Pestilence* is now a far less drastic destroyer than it has ever been. Science is doing wonders in perfecting the healing arts which are steadily reducing the death rate from *disease;* and *vice* is in many ways reduced as a destructive force in human society. These are all patent facts to all who have eyes to see things as they really are. And all of this means that the "checks" which were once efficient in keeping down the surplus of the human species are not as potent in doing that work as they once were, and that they are all growing less and less so, every day. This is so true that, for the last half century, there has been an increase of three years in the average lifetime of human beings, take the world as a whole. So much is certain, and so much is enough for the argument we are following now.

But the fundamental possibilities for race surplus in the human species are as great as ever; indeed, greater, unless some other check or checks are inaugurated to take the place of those which have lost their original potency. So much is beyond dispute. And yet there have been, and still are, those who ignore or dispute this most evident situation; and to these, at least, some attention must be given, some answer must be made, and hence what follows:

The simplest of all these are not worthy the name of antagonists. They do not oppose; they only ignore. They pooh-pooh the whole proposition, and side-step the entire affair. They say: "Why fret? There always has been enough on the earth for all the people who were alive on it, at any one time, and so there always will be! And, anyhow, if there ever is trouble on this score, we shan't be here to suffer from it! So let 'er roll!" And these are not worth replying to. Let them alone!

Mr. Malthus himself met the situation something as follows: Although he did not say so in so many words, he led his readers to infer that the six "checks" to the surplus in the human species, namely, war, famine, poverty, pestilence, disease and vice, were God-ordained, and that, as such, they should not be "meddled with"! (Same old story!) And, as a matter of fact, many a philanthropic move whose aim was the betterment of mankind in England has been thwarted by adherents to the theory that it would be "contrary to Nature" to thus prevent the necessary elimination of a human surplus which must be disposed of in some way! Fact!

As for Malthus himself, he proposed one more "check," as follows: He urged the regulation of marriage by law, to the effect that none should be permitted to marry unless they could show that they were possessed of property enough to take good care of any children they might have; and that all marriages should be postponed till such time as would make it impossible for any couple to have more than a limited number of children. He would have both grooms and brides at least thirty-five years old before they went to the altar, or even older than this, when possible! Meantime, he insists that all these people should live absolutely "continent lives." With this addition to the other six "checks," he was confident the world would never become overpopulated. And I don't see the need of making any answer to that! Do you?

Other opposers of the possible-surplus theory have held that Nature's resources are inexhaustible; that it has never yet been demonstrated how productive the earth can be made; that if population is too crowded in some places the surplus can go somewhere else; that discoveries may yet be made whereby food may be chemically made from the air; and, in any event, there is no need of crossing a stream till one gets to it, etc., etc. These would remove the "checks" which have so far been in evidence where possible; but they would set up none in their place, and trust to luck, or ingenuity, to avoid troublesome complications.

These may be replied to, as follows: If the surface of the earth were not a limited area, their theory might hold. But it is limited; and because it is, even though it might be possible to feed the whole human race from the air, without money and without price, yet it would be only a matter of time till there would not be even "standing room only" on this old globe for the billions of its inhabitants who would have need for a "place in the sun," if they could be fed and clothed free of charge! This is merely a mathematical certainty which is so simple that I need not figure it out for you. You can easily think it out for yourself. Meantime, it may not be amiss to call your attention to the fact that the world's latest and greatest war was caused chiefly, or in a large measure, at least, by a pressure of population, real and prospective, something as follows:

With a scientific foresight which Germany possessed beyond all other nations, her rulers saw that it was inevitable that she must have more room for her rapidly increasing population, or there would be insurmountable troubles ahead, and this she proposed to have, come what might from such action. To this end, she took no thought of trying to limit her surplus of births, but sought rather to stimulate to its utmost of production this factor in her problem. With her totally materialistic view of the method and mission of all life, she espoused the principle of the "Survival of the Fittest" as the only efficient cause of all progress, human or otherwise; and this she translated into the philosophy of "Might Makes Right," and with all the power she could command she set to work to make herself the mistress of the world on this basis! What she proposed to do was to make "a place in the sun" for herself and hers, no matter whether any other human being in all the world had a case to put his head in or not! With a population that had already reached the density of 300 to the square mile, and with the number of square miles which her rapidly increasing surplus needed for accommodation, limited as it was, she saw that the only thing to do to make sure of her future welfare, figured on this basis, was to make room for herself and hers, and this she proposed to do, come what might!

All of which means that it was a prospective pressure of population, and an effort to relieve the same, which was really the chiefest cause of Germany's bringing about the world's greatest war. Of this, as a final analysis, there is not a shadow of doubt.

And when one puts in with this the fact that England, with her population of 600 to the square mile, was also in need of more room for herself and hers, while Italy with her 350 to the square mile, was sending out an average of nearly a million emigrants a year to find homes where they could; and Belgium, with her 650 to the square mile was using every endeavor within her power to find places for her surplus which was crowding to the limits of sustainable pressure, to say nothing of the pressure in Russia and the Far East—I say, when one puts all these facts together, it is self-evident that, even as things now are, it was the surplus of population which was a prime factor in causing the most recent and terrible of all wars.

Curious fact it is, that none of these nations which engaged in this war (unless we except France) ever thought of relieving the situation by cutting down the birth-rate by birth control! I suppose one reason why they did not was the fact that they were not yet far enough advanced in the real principles of genuine humanity to comprehend such a way of escape from an untoward situation; and, further, that none of them dared, or could, use this method of relieving this over-pressure of population unless all the other nations with whom they were in rivalry, adopted the same means at the same time. And this, as things then were, was an utter impossibility. It needed the crass stimulus of this war to wake these nations up to a realizing sense of the situation and to at least suggest to them a way of escape which would be at once humane and effective! But as they were, all these nations were on the low plane of mere materialism; they had, perhaps unwittingly, embraced the philosophy of The Survival of the Fittest as the law of all life-progress, and they saw possible help from out a perilous situation only by means of carrying out the principle of a materialistic evolution, namely, that might makes right, and that it is as it should be that the strongest should take all they can get, and keep all they have, utterly regardless of any and every one but themselves and theirs! This is the law of the animal man! It is *not* the law of the plus of humanity!

What the law of the plus of humanity suggests is, that it would be far better sense, far more humane, to limit the number of children born into this world, than it is to destroy the surplus of the human species by such means as have heretofore prevailed in disposing of such super-abundance of mankind. Doesn't that proposition sound reasonable? And if it is reasonable; and further, if it is within the possibilities for human ingenuity to devise and put into operation ways and means for keeping down the surplus, doesn't it seem as though it was the right thing to do to use such a method of dealing with this issue, rather than any other? It would certainly seem so to any sane soul, if there are any such souls! But let us not rail!

There are other opponents to the Malthusian theory who declare that the higher any life-organism is developed the less productive it becomes, and that this principle, as exemplified in the human species, will eventually cancel the tendency of the race to over-breed. Let us look into this theory, and see what the evidences are of its truthfulness: So far as instinctive life is concerned, the theory is undoubtedly correct. The finest varieties of apples grow on trees which are "shy bearers," and the highest bred stock produce the fewest descendants. This is all true. But my own observation leads me to make a distinction just here, so far as the human species is concerned. These theorists seem to hold that culture, training, college education, the possession of great wealth, moving in the best society, etc., that these are all marks of high bred people; and, consequently, that it is these people who have a less ability to breed than have those who are ignorant or poor. And here is where my doubt comes in. As I have suggested on some former page, my observation leads me to the conclusion that it is not inability to reproduce that keeps these people from having large families; but that, being what they are, and being able to obtain certain knowledge in the premises; or having the means which will enable them to disregard the laws in such cases made and provided, they do, by a wilful birth-control, keep their families within the limits of their purposes and desires. I am not able to bring statistics to prove this point either; but I believe your conclusions will be mine if you will look about among the people of all classes whom you know, and make up your minds from your own observations regarding them, so far as this item is concerned.

But, grant, for the sake of argument, that these people are right in their theory, namely, that culture and wealth tend to sterilize the possessors of one or both; still, one cannot help wondering when the whole human race, the total of the rank and file, including the hewers of wood and the drawers of water, are going to come into the possession of, or attain to the amount of culture and wealth which will sterilize them to the extent that, take the race as a whole, there will be no surplus of the species that will have to be provided for, or against! If these objectors to the Malthusian theory can show that their proposed remedy will do the work, that is enough. For myself, I don't believe that it can ever do it. My thought is, that their holding as they do is only one way of side-stepping an issue which they are really unwilling or afraid honestly to face.

A modern philosopher who was a very pronounced opponent to the Malthusian theory, made an answer to it which was unique—and wrong! In his great desire to impress his theories upon his readers, he made the claim that, if these were once established, all else would be well with the world. And here is how he disposed of the "surplus of the species," as it pertains to the human race. He said that the web of generations is like the diagonals in a piece of cloth. Beginning at any given point, these lines expand equally in opposite directions! How many children a man may have is problematical, he says, but that he had two parents is certain, and that each of these two had two in turn, is equally sure! And then, on this basis he invites those who believe in the Malthusian theory to "figure the thing out" and see what answer they get. Let us do that, for a little, at least:

My father and mother had eight children; each of us had two parents and four grandparents. Good! But, with each of us children having four grandparents, we, all together, had but *four*, and not *thirty-two*, as this man's theory would make us have! *Quod erat Demonstrandum!* Curious how some people reason! No! In the web of generations the diagonals grow wide apart much faster on the forward march than they do when moving in the opposite direction. And this settles this argument so far as it opposes Mr. Malthus' theory.

One point further: It goes without saying that the establishment of some check, or checks, to prevent a surplus of mankind is a matter of necessity for the self-preservation of the race, and self-preservation is the first law of life! And because this is so, in the natural order of things it is not a question in the premises as ~~to~~ what *should* be, but of what *must* be, which is my special contention.

Once more: It should be noted that all the crude checks to the surplus of humanity which I have mentioned, namely, war, famine, etc., are, in many respects, *chance* items in the count, and that is both a good and a great reason why they should be eliminated as factors in human out-workings. According to the principles I have urged, and which are fundamental in all substantial human progress, all forms of *chance* should be removed from human affairs of every kind, and the reign of deliberate human choice and deliberate human control by means of the exercise of the human will, should be set up in its stead. This is, this can be, the only abiding law for the advancement of the human race. *And the control of birth in the human species is no exception to this universal law!*

Reviewing all these points which I have so partially called your attention to, is it not clear that, without "checks" of some sort, the human species will constantly tend to produce a surplus, which must be gotten rid of, in some way, or a congestion of population will surely follow? And does it not further follow that, with the old initial checks removed, or losing their force, another, or others, must be devised to take their place? Is it not equally certain that human *desire* is in favor of such checks being found and made efficient? And do not all the probabilities suggest that human *imagination* and human *ingenuity* will be equal to the task of supplying the need which such desire suggests? That is, is it not possible that the bringing of children into this world by *choice* rather than by *chance* is at least a human possibility, both in particular and in general? And, this granted, my argument on this point is closed, so far as this part of the issue is concerned.

One other point in this connection, and then my thesis as to why what *should* be will become what *must* be in these matters will be at an end. This is a consideration of the entrance of machinery into modern life as a factor in human affairs. I cannot go into this branch of the subject to any great length, nor is there need of my doing so; but I must mention a few items which are germane to the issue we are here discussing, as follows:

Up to a very few years ago, the number and amount of things that could be made for human use was a limited quantity. The total of such output was what human hands, directly applied to secure given results, could accomplish. For instance, the number of pairs of shoes that could be made in the entire United States, when I was a boy, was only such as could be produced by the shoemakers in this country. These did all the work by hand, and the number of hands so employed was a definite and determinable quantity, which could not be greatly increased, even in a considerable length of time. But today! Why, today the number of *machines* that can be made for making shoes is practically limitless! And this fact, and thousands more that are practically identical with it, bear a very important relation to the item of population, not only in the United States, but in every country in the world.

And the relation they bear is this: The profusion of machines which are now doing the world's work is rendering the direct employment of human hands to do the work which they once did, less and less necessary. The result is that conditions are fast arising which make it harder and harder for human hands to find any employment at all! In plain terms, there are too many of them to do what work there is left for human hands to do! And this means a surplus of population, when translated into words that apply to the problem we are now studying.

To overcome this new order of things in human history, various expedients are being resorted to, the chief of which is the shortening of the number of hours per day or week in which the labor done by human hands can be employed. These are growing fewer and fewer, with each recurring year, as the number of machines used increases and the number of hands that need employment grow more and more numerous. This is a terse statement of one phase of the situation; and what it means is not hard to decipher. It is only one more proof of a surplus of human beings, where a fewer number would meet all needful requirements. And the question is, what to do about it?

Another effort that is very generally being made to help out in this threatening crisis is put forth by the unionizing of labor, and thereby attempting to limit the number of hands that may be employed in any and all vocations. The old system of apprenticeship has been practically abandoned in all trades and professions, and the standard of acquirements which these demand has been raised at the same time, until now many, if not most, of these organized labor associations absolutely control the market for their employment, and it is constantly getting more difficult for non-union labor to find any employment at all. And as I write these lines, just at the close of the great war, the supreme problem of the hour is how to find employment for the millions of soldiers who are returning from army life. And, to increase this complication, during the years which these soldiers have been in army service, women have been employed by the millions to do the work which men once did, and they have done it so well that their employers are loath to let them go.

And if they do not go, the question is, where will the men who once did this work find work to do? This, in spite of the concurrent fact that many millions of men who formerly did the work that women are now doing, are dead and buried on the fields of Belgium and France!

In the face of all this, there is a scarcity of work to be done, and a steadily increasing number of hands that are seeking and needing employment! This is a situation which is bound to grow more and more intense, rather than less strenuous, as the future becomes the present; and because this is so, it is a situation which demands the most careful and thoughtful attention of all who have the well-being of humanity in mind. War-following conditions may have upset this order of things temporarily, but the principle is perpetual, and the situation I have outlined will ultimately obtain, give it time.

Add to these things the certainty of the producing possibilities of the machinery which is sure to be soon set up in countries which are now densely populated, but which have not, as yet, engaged in manufacturing, and the seriousness of the problem grows more and more pronounced. For many years, Germany has kept Italy from becoming a manufacturing nation. Italy has no coal, and Germany, through her power as a member of the Triple Alliance, would not permit Italy to develop her water-power, of which she has a great abundance; and so this densely populated nation has been unable to employ her people at home, and has been obliged to get rid of her surplus population by emigration. But now Italy, released from her former lord and master, is planning to harness up her waterfalls and put this long-latent power at work driving all sorts of machines which are to make all sorts of things, for all sorts of people, all over the whole world!

And what Italy purposes to do, Japan stands ready to duplicate, *ad lib!* Add Russia to this same order of proposed extended mechanical exploitation, together with other great nations of the Far East, and something of the extent of what the future has in store for humanity on this count may be somewhat generally comprehended, to say the least.

And all this can mean but one thing, namely, that under this order of things, there is a constant lessening of opportunity for laborers to do the work of the world, and this must mean that there must be a corresponding lessening of the number of laborers to do what work is left to be done by human hands, or trouble is bound to ensue. All of which inevitably links itself up to the problem we are now studying, and proves, beyond doubt, that some "check" *must* be put upon human reproduction, if a healthy and wholesome state of affairs is to obtain in the coming generations. And this means that the having of children by *chance*, as under the old order of things, must pass, and the having of them by *choice*, where their number can be controlled by the exercise of the human will must take its place. And this is another reason why what should be will be compelled to become what must be.

As to how the number of children born, as a whole, is to be determined, under this order of things, this is, of course, an open question, and one which time and experiment alone can answer. I have no idea that it will ever result from edicts issued from some central authority; but rather that it will arrive by way of a free and natural response of people who know, and who have within their own resources, the means of increasing or decreasing the supply of human beings that will best meet the social requirements of any day or age. Suggestions as to these needs, one way or the other, can now be readily disseminated all over the earth, and that such suggestions will be heeded and acted upon is certainly not beyond the possibilities of realization. The experiences of this last war fully warrant the possibility of such action, where we have more than once seen millions of people, of different nationalities, of widely separated conditions and beliefs, respond, almost as an unit, to the mere suggestion that this or that be done! Sugar bowls were but gingerly relieved of their contents, all over the civilized world, at the mere *request* that they be so treated; and whole nations went without Sunday rides in their automobiles upon the mere *asking* of those who discovered and disclosed the need of their so doing in order to save gasoline wherewith to win the war. These are facts which go to prove the latent possibilities that are inherent in humanity (the plus of it!) in response to needed requirements which inure to the good of mankind! My thought is, that if conditions arose in which there was a reasonable probability that the human race was increasing faster than was best for the interests of all parties concerned, all over the earth, that a general dissemination of the knowledge of such fact would automatically meet a response on the part of the vast majority of the people who knew how to have children by choice rather than by chance, and who would be glad to act according to the needs or demands of the situation. And the opposite of this would probably work out equally well. If people, so equipped, knew that there was need of a greater population for a succeeding generation, they would respond to such need, upon being informed of the situation.

Of course, such attainments and responses as I have just outlined could not be realized immediately, or all at once. Great changes in the beliefs and practices of mankind seldom come suddenly, and they never come in perfection. Nevertheless, great changes do come, and the results they establish are enduring and in the line of making the good better, and the better ever tending towards the best.

And this is my main contention, namely, that what has worked out so well, so many times, in the history of the world, will work out equally well in this new field for its exploitation.

As to how the mastery of the Science of Procreation, in accordance with these requirements, is to be obtained, and how the same is to be generally disseminated, among all classes of people, these also are problems which the future alone can solve. I have made some tentative suggestions on these points in previous pages, but the whole situation is so new and so complicated that it will require the ablest efforts of the ablest men and women in the world, through long years of study and experimentation before success will be obtained. But there are no reasons why attempts in the right direction should not be begun, and that they will be begun, and that before long, I believe to be absolutely certain. I have already called the attention of my readers to certain signs of the times pointing in this direction, and every day such signs are multiplying, all along the line. As I write, there comes to my desk a journal which is devoted entirely to the subject of birth-control, and many medical publications and other printed documents are taking up the discussion of the subject in no uncertain way. My belief is that, in the very near future, societies will be formed, all over this and other countries, for the study and discussion of this subject; and that, as a result of such organizations, the first step will be taken which will open up the possibility of further and real progress in the premises. This first step will be the repealing of the mal-formed and ill-considered laws upon this subject, which now stand upon the statute books of many states and nations, thereby making it practically impossible for any real progress to be made in solving these greatest problems which now lie before the human race. The membership in these associations will become so numerous and so forceful that their united voice will be heard and heeded by legislators and courts, in no uncertain way. Action will follow these demands, and other results will duly follow in natural sequence. This is inevitable!

A recent world-wide attainment that will make such progress much easier than it would otherwise be, is the fact that Modern Science has now created a passionless vocabulary by means of which this whole subject can now be publicly discussed without shocking even the most sensitive by its consideration of the theme. Besides this, it is unquestionably true that this same Modern Science has tended, in many ways, to make multitudes of men and women open-minded and fair, and to be honestly anxious to know the truth in these matters, as in all others. These are great attainments, such as the world has never before seen, and they all tend to make possible a successful working-out of the principles and practices which I have outlined in this book.

The point I want to urge, in closing this chapter, is, that what I have maintained *should be* in my earlier pages, I trust I have, in these later pages, proven *must* be, in due course of time. And I would like to urge, in addition to this, that you who read these lines, help along the cause I have herein set forth, and that *you* do what you can to promote its forwarding and its interests. My feeling is that this cause is just, and because it is so, it is worthy of the best efforts of all men and women, everywhere. You, whoever you are, are one of such; and as such, do what you can for what, in your heart of hearts, you believe is right. So may it be!

In closing this chapter, I cannot do better than to quote a part of a leading editorial from one of the most stable and forceful literary and scientific journals published in the United States, as follows:

"There is no more important question to be faced at the present time than this problem of the birth-rate. At the same time, *we have got to admit that procreation is not the sole way in which the sexual instinct is satisfied at the present time, and we cannot forbid rational enquiry into the origin of this distinction.* What is lamentable in the present and widespread movement for birth-control is not its existence, but the fact that behind it there is so little knowledge. *If there is any subject into which ceaseless enquiry, medical, statistical, sociological, psychological, is needed, it is this problem. Research nowhere can so deeply affect the welfare of society as in the fullest investigation of the issues involved.* Thus far we have contributed nothing save senseless legislation and its still more senseless enforcement. The American nation might as well understand that prison never solved any biological question; that, indeed, in order to thrive, it must confront squarely the facts of the age."

It is to help forward this cause and secure the results it aims to obtain that I have in a previous paragraph, asked my readers, whoever they may be, to each one "do his bit" "for country and for God"!

CHAPTER XVI

ONE OTHER CORRELATED SUBJECT

After I had finished writing the previous chapter, by a curious happening the following letter came into my possession, and for reasons I give it audience here, under the above heading. It goes without saying that, while it is certainly germane to the issue I have considered in these pages, yet the questions it presents are much too vast and far-reaching to be adequately discussed in a book of this size, especially at this stage of the proceedings. Still, because the letter is so forceful, and because it presents a live issue, and because it says so well some things that we all ought to think about, at least, I quote it as follows:

Let me say, by way of introduction, that this letter was written by an unmarried woman, forty-five years of age. It was written to an intimate woman friend, of like age and condition. The writer is a highly educated woman, and author of several books of the highest literary quality, and has a reputation that covers the most intelligent nations in two continents. She is the possessor of a fine physique, and her whole nature is that of the highest spiritual sort. In a word, she is a magnificent specimen of womankind, at its possible best. She writes:

"I am one of a large, and, in these days, a constantly growing class, numerically speaking, of the sexually unemployed.

"Speaking from my own experience and that of a large number of those who are conditioned as I am, I am convinced that those who are compelled to permanently remain unemployed, in any department of life where their employment is a necessary factor for their well-being, are, because of the abnormal conditions under which they are forced to live, in constant danger of becoming harmful to themselves and to their fellows among whom they dwell.

"In lines of life other than sexual, men make laws and regulations whose purpose it is to remedy untoward employment conditions. They strive to find employment for the unemployed, and they protect those who are employed from the possibility of being over-worked in their several callings. They guard the young from being put to severe service too early in life, and prescribe employment conditions for the employed, which will result in the best good of the parties concerned. But in matters which pertain to sex employment, which is really one of the most important in all human affairs, individually or socially considered, here, not one thing is done to remedy unhealthful and untoward, not to say threatening, conditions; but vast multitudes of men and women are relegated to live under conditions where it is impossible for them to find honorable employment, such as their natures require if they remain normal and healthy individuals, fulfilling their rightful functions as regards themselves, and in their social life. On the other hand, nothing is done to curb the possibilities of the most shameful overworking of those who are respectably and legally sexually employed, and who may be compelled to suffer unspeakable abuse from those under whose control they are legally placed.

"The thing that forces itself upon me is this: Are these things as they ought to be; and, if they are not, can anything be done to make them nearer right than they now are? As one of the sexually unemployed, and on behalf of my fellow-sufferers from this cause, I ask these questions. That is, I ask them to myself, in the dark, as it were, for who would dare to ask them in the daylight, or where everybody could hear and know what I said? And who among the sexually employed cares, or dares, to even try to make a truthful answer, one which would at least suggest a remedy for these untoward, not to say positively sinful conditions? Do you know any such one? If so, please tell him for me to speak up!"

Regarding this letter, one can but say that, somehow, these things which the writer mentions are not as they ought to be, and it is something worth while that she calls attention to that fact. It is for that reason that I have felt it practically a duty to give what she says, as I have.

As to what to do about it, that is another question. For myself, I say frankly that I have nothing definite to suggest; and I don't know any one who has! Still, that is no reason why the problem should not be stated, or why it should be put aside as unsolvable. It is the mission of life to right all wrongs, and that this woman has pointed out great wrongs is unquestionable. And the only thing for true men and women to do is to set themselves to work on the problem; and, in time, work it out to a successful issue.

But this much is certain, namely, that the having of children by *choice* rather than by *chance* would, in a measure, at least, relieve the present unsatisfactory conditions which now keep large numbers of the sexually unemployed from marrying, and that would be something in the right direction.

As a matter of fact, the mind of the Western world has never yet viewed the problem of the sex-impulse in humanity, either for the married or the unmarried, from its rightful angle. The opinions of the neo-platonic ascetics became intermingled with the dogmas of the early Christian theologies, many centuries ago, with the result that the idea of the unworthiness of the human body, and especially the sex part of it, was fastened upon occident mentality with a grip which still holds millions of people in its thrall. And to break away from such deep-seated and long-standing teachings and beliefs will require time and patience and the wisest of instruction for many years. And yet, all these things must come to pass, in the eternal order of things!

* * * * * *

As I wrote on the first page of this book, contentment with attained conditions is not an attitude of mind which brings the best results to humanity, in any part of its being or estate. Life is eternal progress, and so far as the human race is concerned, that progress must be made in the realms of The Plus of Humanity, and *Love and Service* are the only factors which can always be counted on to keep the race going in that direction. And *Love and Service* come always at the beck of *choice*, and not of *chance* and hence their offices are strictly in harmony with the main thesis of all I have written in these pages. It is only in accord with the principles embodied in these words that I have said what I have said. If you, whoever you are, will read what I have written in the spirit in which I have written it, good, and only good can result to all parties concerned.

And so, for you and for me, I write for the last time, and as the sum total of what everything in life amounts to, LOVE AND SERVICE!

THE END

INDEX

A

"Abortion condemned," 179
Abortion discussed, 250
Absolute continence, 192, 193
Absolute mutuality in all normal sex-expression, 222
Abuse of appetite for food, 56
Abuse of sex-expression, 214
Aceticism defined and its results noted, 253
Acknowledge the facts, 119
Acts to be judged by their results, 147
Affectional expression a stimulant, 211
Affectional sex-expression, 154
Affectional sex-expression no necessary part of reproduction, 215
After-dinner talk, 48, 54
Aids to eyes and ears, 71
All-important fact, 100
"All the Children of All the People," 14
Amongst animals, no danger, 110
"Anæsthetic" women, 129
Analogical methods used, 22
Analogies between man and lower animals mostly worthless, 38
Analogy and syllogism, 221
Angle worms and fertilization, 167
Animal breeding based on instinct, 42
Animals cannot choose, 79
Animal experiences not like those of mankind, 40
Animal fertilizing material, 165
Animals have no choice, 85
Animals have one form of sex-expression, 206
Animal instinct, 106
Animals only eat to live, 45
Apostle of Love and Service, 15
Appeal to love of show, 264
Apple-egg fertilization, 157
Apple-egg powerless to choose, 177
Application of methods of Choicc, 176
Apprenticeship abandoned, 335
Arithmetical progression of food supply, 317
Art of Love puzzling, 233
Art of war, how developed, 305
Authority and Morality, 148
Auto-erotic acts of children, 218, 219

B

Basic principles for foundation, 22
Bear few children, 131
Bees build as they must, 41

Begetting of children should be a matter of choice, 138
Bergson's theory applied to sex-expression, 213
Bestial manner of feeding, 49
Bettering humanity, 87
Bicycles and morality, 145
"Big Stick" moves the material world, 311
Biological and affectional purpose of marriage, 217
Birds build their nests, 76
Birth control now possible, 288
Birth rate kept high, 262
Blasphemy of the "let-alone" theory and practice, 233
Burden of care and anxiety lifted, 242

C

Can anything be done, 111
Change in laws necessary, 227
Chance a factor in primitive life, 28
Chance now supreme factor, 135
"Checks" for surplus of species, 308
"Checks" in human species must be, 332
"Checks" upon population, 321, 322
Chief cause of marital troubles, 216
Children, multi-millionaire's, 246
Children by choice better citizens, 249
Chivalry, 113
Choice, a human characteristic, 37
Choice a measure of human progress, 28
Choice a significant factor, 176, 178
Choice as a factor in plant and animal progress, 29
Choice impossible below man, 177
Christian woman, The, 92
Church leaders objectors to birth control, 271
Church situation, 281
Church-taught peoples, 131
Civil institutions supersede church, 282, 283
"Come!" the call to mental and spiritual life, 311
Commercial sex-exploitation exterminated, 256
"Common law," 96
"Conception," 174
Conditions in China, 12
Condition preceding birth, 199
Congressional attitude on the subject, 13
"Consider the Lilies," 39
Cook-books not to be suppressed, 57
"Copulation," 170
Corn-silk and corn-tassels, 160
Crab-apple tree fruit, 33
Crass stimulus of war, 328
Crime of abortion would be removed, 250
Crime to impart knowledge, 136
Criminal offense to limit possibilities, 187
Crochet work, 48
Crude means used to stimulate primitive man, 302
Curious and significant fact, 111

D

Death rate of chance-born babies high, 277
Debauchery the result of dissatisfaction, 243

Democracy of the human body, 133
Demonstration by civilized humanity, 123
Dense population of Belgium, 327
Dense population of England, 327
Dense population of Germany, 326
Derivation of "Morals," 144
Desire at low ebb, 128
Desire for children natural, 245
Desire, Imagination, Ingenuity, 69, 70, 84, 128
Dickens, Charles, 261
Difference between pollen and spermatazoa, 166
Difficulties of the problem of voluntary human reproduction can be overcome, 138
Dinner described, A, 46, 47
Diphtheria and yellow fever overcome, 137
Disagreements and insistences, 117
Disease diminishing, 322
Disgrace and responsibility of the profession, 15
Divine impulse, 106
Divinely ordained purpose of marriage, 217
Divorce courts are abnormalities, 210
Doctrine of "don't" gives no progressive results, 257
Doomed to disappointment, 9
Doubting souls, 279
Do your bit, 343
Duty to society, 186

E

Ear-helpers, 71
Early history of Monogamy, 112
Early manifestations of affectional sex-expression, 218
Economy of nature, 310
Edicts will never regulate number of births, 338
Efforts of military leaders, 263
Element of slavery in marriage, 113
Eliminate risk of reproduction, 223
Emerson, 66
Enforced inhibition, 182
"Evolution of Dodd," 14
Example of German efficiency, 292
Example of Jacob, 275
Experiments in New Zealand and Holland, 12
Experiences of men and women regarding sex-expression, 139
Exploiters of human labor, 271
Exploiters of the poverty-stricken, 273
Extreme suppression of a natural impulse dangerous, 140
Eyesight has two modes of expression, 67
Eye-helpers, 71
Eye-sight in men and mere animals, 63, 64

F

Famine and Chance, 29
Famine now largely impossible, 313
Far East problem, 337
Full expression of possibilities, 196
Fertilization of cells, 155
Fertilization of human egg-cells, 174
Fewer children could be better nourished, 249

Fifth Symphony, 68
"Fifty-fifty" the basis of sex-expression, 217
Final moral-arbiter, 152
Financial straits prevent marriage, 252
Fires of passion left uncontrolled, 230
Food chemically made from air, 325
Food per square mile, 319
Food supply and species limitation, 307
Food supply something to think about, 318
Former duties and deeds of the church, 286
Franklin, 88
Free distribution of sex-literature, 294
Fundamental principles in equity, 115

G

Gate of Purpose, The, 31
Geography and morality, 145
Geometrical progression of population, 316
Germany and Italy, 336
Germany's scientific foresight, 325
Generous view of natural desires, 59
"Gestation period," 171
Getting drunk right or wrong? 151
Giraffe's-neck theory, 212
Girl babies tolerated, 262
Gluttons in the world, 56
God-born expression, 105
God's intent, 89
God no respecter of persons, 194
Golden Rule applied, 152
"Go!" the demand in the material world, 311
"Go to the ant," 37
Great changes in belief and practice come slowly, 339

H

Habitual unrest leads to quarrels, 244
Handicap of ignorance, 12
Harder for human hands to find employment, 333
"Hard knocks" aroused primitive man, 307
Have people a right to remain unmarried? 189
Hearers fewer than seers, 55
Hearing and the plus of humanity, 67
Heart to Heart talk, 97
Help the cause along, 342
Helps to humanity, 70
Hindoo philosopher, 75
"Holy ground," 164
Honesty of Church leaders, 269
Honor to whom honor is due, 270
How animal eggs are fertilized, 168
How cells multiply, 155
How flowers are fertilized, 157
How human progress began, 50
Humane and effective plan, 328
Human acts cannot be measured by animal standards, 43
Human beings begin life on animal plan, 80
Human body held to be contemptible, 57
Humanity and common sense, 23
Human physical appetite controlled by choice, 45

Human species no exception to law of increase, 332
Human will, a check, 314
Human will, a factor, 86
Human will, the basis of plus of humanity, 44
Husband could kill wife, 115

I

Ignorance and innocence, 154
"If two shall agree," 116
Ill-considered laws must be repealed, 341
Imagination for partner, 106
Imagination supplements desire, 50
Immediate legislation may be had, 15
Impulse, 77, 78, 84
Incarnating souls haphazard? 30
Increase in average life-time, 323
Indefiniteness of the situation, 10
India conditions, 12
Indications of reason and common sense, 200
Infertile cells, 155
Ingenuity supplements imagination, 50
Indiscriminate indulgence, 102
Individuality determines its own actions, 38
Individual liberty, 190
Instinct, 75, 84
Instinct is universal, 83
Instinct makes no progress, 77
Instinct not sufficient guide, 81
Instinct sole guide, 99
Intuitive knowledge safe guide, 84
Intuition, 81, 82, 84
Issue involves many items, 179
Italy released from former condition, 336

J

Jack Tanner's exclamation, 246
Japan as a factor in the problem, 337
Jealousy rooted in selfishness, 254
Journalism a help, 340
Judgment, 82
"Judgment Day" in advance, 55
Jungle and an unknown way, 127
Justice and right, 192

K

Knowledge of science of reproduction now possible, 289, 290

L

Labor for original researches, 31
Law compels a wife to submit, 222
Law of surplus never repealed, 314
Laws of United States, 181
Laws to stimulate reproduction, 272
Legal rights, 106
Letter from an unmarried woman, 344, 345
Letter regarding extreme suppression of the sex-impulse, 141
"Let them alone," 229
"Let them lie in the bed they made," 236

Licentiousness outside wedlock, 251
Life is eternal progress, 298
Life-Force always moves man up, 301
Life-Force's problem? 302
Life-forms practically sexless, 207
Life has rallied from all retrogressions, 299
Lily has no volition, 41
Limited mission of eyesight in animals, 64
Literature and eyesight, 65
Living a continual lie, 96
Long, H. W., M. D., 237
Low French birth-rate, 287
Love and Service, 348, 349
Love-exchanges essential to marital happiness, 225
Lowly origin of the human race, 300
Lying modes of sex-living, 98

M

Maeterlinck, 39
Machinery as a factor in the problem, 333
Main thesis to be read as written, 348
Malthus, Rev. T. R., 315, 323
Malthus' Law of species, 316
Man and Superman, 246
Man eats to live, and something more, 45
Mankind outside animality, 109
Mankind outside comparison with mere animals, 38
Mankind something more than any other life forms, 43
Man made in God's image, 302
Man's meddling with nature, 72
Man more than flesh and blood, 206
Marital rights, 216
Marriage gives free rein to sex-exploitation, 217
Mastery of reproductive sex-expression demanded, 138
Materially constructive purpose of food, 62
Matters of must, 176
Meaning of righteousness, 146
Mechanical progress through choice, 34
Meddling with Nature, 35, 198
Medical Society's "meddling with nature" report, 35
Mendel, 39, 41
Militarism must have armies, 286
Military situation considered, 278
Miracles not frequent, 103
Mission of church now spiritual, 284
Mission of sex in human family, 118
Modern Science to the rescue, 341
Moral act may be unrighteous, 146
Morality and righteousness compared, 144
Morality the "proper thing," 144
"Mortify the flesh," 254
Most children born by chance, 202
Much prudery swept away, 293
Multi-millionaire children, 246
Multiplication of species and food supply, 307
Mutual agreement, 116
Mutuality of sex-expression

healthful and wholesome, 225
Mutual consent not required, 110
Mutual expressions promote well-being, 209
Myriads of waiting souls, 199
Mystery for science to solve, 291

N

Nature and instinct not sufficient guides, 229
Nature and man working together, 30
Natural desire for Children, 245
Natural desires held to be sinful, 58
Needless suffering of husbands and wives, 222
Need of clear exposition, 13
Need of dissemination of sex-knowledge, 228
Neo-platonic ascetics, 348
Nervous breakdown from repression, 185
Never - ought - to - be parents, 258
New-developed philosophy of natural desires, 59
Newness of the whole situation, 340
Newly wedded husbands and wives, 229
North Pole searches, 20
No slight task, 120
Not only rightful way, 108
Not rhapsodising, 107
"Now is the accepted time," 296
Number of cells and life-germs, 197
Number of germs equals stars in the sky, 171

O

Old order is passing away, 87
Omne vivum ex ovo, 156, 165, 172
One must not insist where two are concerned, 116
One standard of right before God, 146
Only one way to maintain a nation, 279
Opinions of "Good Society," 148
Opponents to Malthusian theory, 329
Opposition of church leaders, 266
Original intent and purpose, 134
Ovaries, location and function, 173

P

Pabulum, mental and spiritual, 60
Parker, Theodore, 88
"Parturition," or birth, 171
"Patiently wait for outcome," 237
Paul's declaration, 91
People who like to see things, 55
Perfect harmony, 107
Persistence of affectional sex-expression, 219
Personal observations, 126
Philanthropic moves thwarted, 324
"Phones," "phone" words, 71, 72
Physical appetite for food as shown in mankind, 45
"Pigment spot," 63
"Pie belt," 47
Pitfalls and bogs left open for newlyweds, 231
Plagues and chance, 28

Playing "dead dog," 141
Plus becomes more and more supreme, 73
Plusses of eyesight, 66
Plus of Humanity defined, 44
Plus of humanity, 203
Pollen and its mission, 158
Poor people not obliged to have children, 248
Population doubling every 50 years, 309
Population of British Islands, 320
Population per square mile, 319, 320
Portal of Chance, The, 31
Possibilities for race surplus great as ever, 323
Possibility of coercion, 115
Possibility of parentage eliminated, 184
Possible power of choice in human breeding, 42
Pregnancy, 174
Pregnancy and affectional sex-expression, 220
Pre-historic testimony, 298
"Presto, pass," 88
Primal qualities in mankind, 300
Primary checks on human reproduction passing away, 332
Primary expression, 105
Prime factor in great war, 327
Primitive eyes, 63
Principle of Progress by choice solidified, 23
Prisons never solved any biological problem, 343
Problem of the unmarried should be stated, 347
"Prodigality of nature," 160, 170
Production of human germs still a surplus, 313
Progress a constant factor, 297, 298
Proposing and opposing, 244
Pros and cons of two modes of sex-expression, 153
Prostitution might be destroyed, 256
Prove up your own acts! 150
Public school sex hygiene, 295
Puritanical influences, 130
Purple sheep, 93
Purpose of clothing, The, 92

Q

Quality not quantity of children born, 250

R

Race suicide, 245
Rank and file kept in ignorance of sex-facts, 139
Raw meat and unground grain, 53
Records necessary, 235
Red clover blossoms, 162
Reduction of births a calamity? 276
Regulation of marriage by law, 324
Relative values of Chance and Choice, 27
Repeal of laws necessary, 136
Requests regarding sugar and gasoline, 338
Results of animal breeding applied to humanity, 274
Results of recent war, 295
Righteousness and morality compared, 144
Rightness or wrongness of method, 195
Ring, mystic symbol, 114
Russia as a factor in the problem, 337

S

Sane or insane birth-control, 13
"Sane Sex-life," 237
Savage tribes and newly-weds, 230
Saying of Bernard Shaw, 117
Saying of Chinese philosopher, 116
Scientific study of conception, 226
Scientific view of bodily functions, 58
Science of Procreation difficult, 233
Science of procreation handicapped, 265
Science of procreation to be mastered, 31
"Scopes," "scope" words, 71, 72
"Seminal fluid," 166
Sex-abnormalities overcome, 256
Sex-expression rises above instinct, 100, 101
Sex-ignorance, 154
"Sex organs," 170
Sexual aberrations resulting from abnormal sex-expression, 142
Sexually overworked, 345
Sexually unemployed, 345
"Shamie! Shamie!" 129
Shaw, Bernard, 246
Shoes and machinery, 334
Should be and must be, 297
Side-saddles and morality, 145
Side-stepping an issue, 330
Sight beyond eyesight, 67
Sight in formation of character, 122
Significant sounds, 68
Significant words, 116
Signs of the times, 237
Sinners only called to repentance, 155
Slow processes of Evolution, 30
Small danger of extravagant indulgence, 243
Smoking and knitting, 52
Societies to be formed for handling the problem, 340
Solomon, 39
Some check on human reproduction must be had, 337
Sophisticated condition, 129
Sources of help received, 20, 21
Source of human-egg supply, 173
"Spawning," 168
Spiritual upbuilding and sex-expression, 214
Spiritual upbuilding one mission of food, 62
Statistics not procurable, 126
Strawberry fertilization, 159
Strictly continent living considered, 226
Strong business man's tears, 247
Subtle procedure of religious leaders, 267
Surface of earth, limited area, 325
Surplus of egg-production, 163
Sum total of life, 349
Surgical instrument used for producing conception, 213
Sweeping conclusion, A, 191
Syllogism on man's Sex-expression, 94
Synchronism of two forms of sex-expression, 224

T

Table-furnishings eliminated, 49

Tatting, 48
Teachings of Jesus Christ, 132
Teaching vs. practice, 95
Tenet of Greek religion, 112
Testimony of keepers of brothels, 225
Testimony of three classes, 127
Theory of Christian Church, 91, 92
Theory one thing, practice another, 90
Theory that culture reduces productivity, 329
Things essentially different not comparable, 40
Third class of objectors, 271
Those best pleased with what they can eat, 54
Three classes of objectors, 260
Three I's, The, 74
Titian, 65
To sum up, 201
Tragedies resulting from abnormal Sex-living, 142
Treatment of auto-erotic children, 219
Triple alliance, 336
True law of normal sex-life sought, 143
Truth and love the cornerstone and arch of real marriage, 218
Twofold manifestation, 204, 205
Two modes of sex-expression in mankind, 104, 105
Two modes of expression for appetite for food, 60

U

Unable to nurse their babies, 136
Under possible control, 109
Undeniable meaning, 125
Undue strain and stress, 130
Unpleasant truths, 268
Unusual instance, 183
Utterly false conditions, 98, 99

W

War, animal and human, 304
War, famine, poverty, etc., 303
War leaders, 261
War probably nearing its end, 312
War the crudest stimulating force, 304
Waste of fertilizing material, 163
Waste of germs deplored? 172
Web of generation, The, 331
What eyesight makes possible, 66
What is right? 178
What is wicked? 191
What married people would prefer, 180
Where does duty begin? 188
Where results of acts may "land," 147
Where trouble comes in, 101
Whitman, 237
Whitman on theories, 212
Who cares or dares to propose a way out? 346
Wholesome manner of living, 134
"Why even of your. lves?" 149
Why young people refrain from marrying, 14
Wilful birth control, 330
Wild hogs and horses, 34
Wives were shut up, 112
Wives were stolen, 111
Wonderful fact, 124

World lesson, 280
World war as a factor, 335
Wrong answer of modern philosopher, 331
Wrong mental attitude regarding reproduction, 169

Y

Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A. valuable factors, 294
Young people prohibited from acquiring Sex-knowledge, 234

14 DAY USE
RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED

LOAN DEPT.

This book is due on the last date stamped below, or
on the date to which renewed.
Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

RECD LD

MAR 15'65-10 AM

SEP 4 1977

REC. CIR. AUG 30 77

DEC 2 1985

REC. CIR DEC 4 '85

LD 21A-40m-4,'63
(D0471s10)476B

General Library
University of California
Berkeley

YB 07406

GENERAL LIBRARY - U.C. BERKELEY
B000940142

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY